The Communist

20c NOVEMBER 1944

Cayey B

THE 27th ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

MARCIA T. SCOTT A. LANDY

•

AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ORGANIZATION

N. MALININ

•

DEWEY AND TEHERAN

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

•

PROBLEMS OF CLUB LEADERSHIP AND DEMOCRACY IN THE C.P.A.

JOHN WILLIAMSON

•

AS WE FACE RECONVERSION

GEORGE MORRIS

•

FUEHRER LEWIS RUNS A CONVENTION

LOUIS F. BUDENZ

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TEHERAN

Our Path in War and Peace

By EARL BROWDER

"We accepted our review copy as an opportunity to learn at first-hand something about Mr. Browder's own ideas instead of what other people think he thinks. . . . The book has been read from cover to cover—carefully, we believe—and we find ourselves in agreement with every one of his main points. . . . Clear thinking, moderation, true patriotism and vision characterize this small volume that furnishes an excellent foundation for a better understanding of the problems that confront America. It merits wide attention."

Fort Wayne (Ind.) Journal-Gazette

Cloth, $1.50, Paper, $.35

•

THE HERITAGE OF THE COMMUNIST POLITICAL ASSOCIATION

By ROBERT MINOR

A brilliant study of the history of the Communist movement in the United States from its earliest inception up to the present stage of the great worldwide war of liberation.

Price $.10

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE WAR AND PEACE
By Earl Browder . . . . . $.02

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XXIII, No. 11 NOVEMBER, 1944

THE COMMUNIST

A MARXIST MAGAZINE DEVOTED TO ADVANCEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC THOUGHT AND ACTION

EARL BROWDER, Editor EUGENE DENNIS, Associate Editor
V. J. JEROME, Managing Editor

CONTENTS

The Soviet Union and the Small Nations	*Marcia T. Scott*	963
The Twenty-Seventh Anniversary of the October Revolution	*A. Landy*	979
An International Security Organization	*N. Malinin*	988
Dewey and Teheran	*William Z. Foster*	1001
Certain Lessons of Versailles	*Prof. A. Trainin*	1015
Problems of Club Leadership and Democracy in the C.P.A.	*John Williamson*	1018
As We Face Reconversion	*George Morris*	1027
The "Reuther Tactic" and the Fight for Labor-Servicemen Unity	*Robert Thompson*	1039
Fuehrer Lewis Runs a Convention	*Louis F. Budenz*	1043
Armistice Agreement with Finland		1052

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. THE COMMUNIST is published Monthly by Workers Library Publishers, Inc., at 832 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y. (mail address, P. O. Box 148, Station D), to whom subscriptions, payments and correspondence should be sent. Subscription rate: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada, $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just Published—

MORALE EDUCATION IN THE AMERICAN ARMY

BY PHILIP FONER

In this new study, a distinguished American historian brings to light a wealth of material, including documents and speeches by Washington, Jackson and Lincoln, letters from soldiers, contemporary newspaper articles and editorials, resolutions and activities of workers' and other patriotic organizations backing up the fighting fronts, all skillfully woven together to make an illuminating analysis of the role of morale in the three great wars of American history—the War of Independence, the War of 1812, and the Civil War.

Price 20¢

MARX AND ENGELS ON REACTIONARY PRUSSIANISM

An important theoretical study which assembles the writings and opinions of Marx and Engels on the historical roots, character and reactionary political and military role of the Prussian Junkers, and illuminates the background of the plans for world domination hatched by the German general staff, the modern industrialists and the criminal Nazi clique.

Price 20¢

WALT WHITMAN—POET OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

BY SAMUEL SILLEN

A new study of the great American poet, together with a discerning selection from his prose and poetic writings which throws light on Whitman's views on the Civil War, democracy, labor, internationalism, culture, etc.

Price $1.50

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Sta. D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE SMALL NATIONS

BY MARCIA T. SCOTT

(On the occasion of the Twenty-Seventh Anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution)

AS IT enters the twenty-eighth year of its existence, the Soviet Union has a proud record to celebrate—a record of ceaseless forward progress for its own people and of immeasurable service to all humanity. At the very top of its record is the shining achievement of eliminating exploitation of man by man and oppression of nation by nation.

Today the Soviet Union, in cooperation with its allies, is engaged in helping to apply on a world scale the great principle of integrity and freedom of nations.

Our enemies know that the realization of this principle spells their doom forever. That is why, as they go down in defeat, they strike wildly at the structure of international cooperation that is rising out of the ruin they have wrought. They know that once it is built securely, the whole world will be an impregnable fortress against them.

Their chief weapon is the monstrous lie that the Soviet Union plans world domination and toward this end is making ready to swallow the small nations of Europe. They raise their bloody hands in supplication for a soft peace so that *they* may save the world from this peril. The lie is echoed loudly by the Bullitts, the Hearsts, the Social-Democratic press, the Trotskyites, the Gerald Smiths—all the various brands of defeatist, isolationist, soft-peace advocates who prefer continued chaos and war to stability and enduring peace, based on friendship with the Soviet Union. It is echoed more softly, but with the same purpose, by those who question slyly whether the small nations were given sufficient attention at Dumbarton Oaks, and warn against a continuing four-power alliance and "deals" that violate the Atlantic Charter.

* * *

The Soviet Family of Nations

To understand what is and must be the policy of the U.S.S.R. toward small nations, it is essential first of all to understand the Soviet nationalities policy as applied within the U.S.S.R., itself a family of nations.

The principle of self-determination for all nations embodied in the Atlantic Charter has always been a cardinal point in Marxist theory and practice. Completely rejecting racial

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factors as a determining force in the degree of development of different peoples, the Marxists knew by their scientific study of history that all social progress is determined by the methods of procuring and producing the means of life and the relations between man and man growing out of those methods. Peoples in modern society who have remained in a primitive, pastoral or semi-feudal state are backward, not because of any lack of natural ability, but because of their material conditions of life, and the exploitation of those conditions by more highly industrialized nations. Tsarist Russia, with its kaleidoscope of peoples, was a particularly flagrant example of this. Deprived of any economic basis for development, with their territories kept in a semi-colonial status in order to feed raw materials to the center, and to prevent their becoming strong and independent, most of the minority peoples lived in a near-primitive state, illiterate, disease-ridden and impoverished. Thus it was natural that the leaders of the October Revolution in Russia should have from the beginning laid special stress on the national question. They knew that the introduction of socialism meant not only putting the means of production into the hands of the Russian workers, but helping to provide means of industrial production for the more backward peoples of Russia.

Because the Tsarist government sought to keep these peoples at a low level, and without independence there was no hope for their advance, the Bolsheviks from the beginning included the right of national self-determination in their program. This question was especially close to the heart of Lenin and Stalin. But it fell to Stalin to elaborate and extend the theoretical work in this field, and after the Revolution, as Commissar of Nationalities, to give leadership in translating the theories into living reality.

As the time grew nearer for the testing of the Bolshevik theories in actual practice, they took more concrete form. A resolution passed at the April, 1917 Conference of the Bolshevik Party said in part:

"The right of all nations forming part of Russia freely to secede and form independent states must be recognized. To deny them this right, or to fail to take measures guaranteeing its practical realization, is equivalent to supporting a policy of seizure and annexation."

This long-considered and carefully worked out policy was put into effect nine days after the Bolsheviks came to power. On November 16, 1917, the Soviet Government issued the famous "Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples of Russia" over the signatures of Lenin and Stalin. It laid down four basic principles which have guided Soviet policy ever since, namely: (1) Full equality and sovereignty for all the peoples of Russia; (2) the right of the peoples of Russia to self-determination, to the point of separation from the state and the creation of new independent governments; (3) the abolition of national and religious privileges and disabilities; and (4) the free development of the na-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional minorities and ethnographic groups inhabiting the territories of Russia. These principles were embodied in the Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (R.S.F.S.R.) adopted in 1918.

The right to secession was put into effect at once. The independence of Finland, Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia was recognized. To be sure, nationalist governments were at that time supported by the Entente in the border states of Russia, not out of any intention to foster their real independence, but in order to create a *cordon sanitaire* against the young Soviet Republic. Had the Baltic States been permitted to fulfill the will of their own peoples, they would no doubt have maintained their short-lived Soviet Governments and eventually applied for federation. But in any case, the exercise of their right to secession would have been the prerequisite to their voluntary union with the other Soviet Republics, as was the case with Armenia, Georgia and the Ukraine.

In 1922 the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was formed by a treaty between the R.S.F.S.R., the White Russian (Byelo-Russian) S.S.R. and the Transcaucasion S.F.S.R. and in the first Union Constitution adopted in 1924, the legal basis of national equality was firmly established, national discrimination made a criminal offense, and the right to secession guaranteed. But the immensely complex problem of establishing *actual* equality among the fifty or more nationalities making up the Soviet Union remained.

That problem, of course, was inseparable from all the other economic and political problems of unparalleled magnitude with which the workers' state was faced. War, civil war, intervention and blockade had left the whole country in a state of economic devastation. The counter-revolution had been defeated, but the heritage of hate and oppression bequeathed by the Tsarist regime could not be eradicated all at once. Nationalities had been set against one another in order to maintain the control of the Great Russians over all the other peoples, and this Great Russian chauvinism did not vanish over night. It in turn gave rise to a local bourgeois nationalism whose leaders attempted to dominate national minorities within their own territory. These local chauvinists derived support from the anti-Leninist ideas and policies of the Trotskyites and Bukharinites whose opposition to the whole program of the building of socialism led them inevitably to the path of collusion with fascism and treachery to their country. The elimination of all such distortions of the national question within the Party, and the realization of the Lenin-Stalin principles against mountainous obstacles, meant a struggle of truly epic proportions, whose outcome has proved vital to the defense of world democracy.

How the struggle was won and these problems overcome in the years that followed—the realization of the confraternity of the free and equal Soviet nations and the rich flowering of the national cultures of all these formerly oppressed peoples of many races, many colors, many ways of life—is one of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most glorious pages in human history.

The story of how these magnificent results were achieved is woven into the whole history of the Soviet Union. For every aspect of its Socialist progress has been shared equally by all its peoples. The only kind of inequality in this regard that could be noted is that the peoples of the minor nationalities received a proportionately greater share of attention and material assistance in order to bring them up to the levels of the other people.

The first necessity of course was to provide the necessary economic base in each national republic and area. This was required, not only to release their productive resources for their own use, but also for the rational development of the industry of the country as a whole, eliminating wasteful transport for long distances over a weak transport system by setting up factories near the source of the raw materials. Lenin's great electrification program, forerunner of the great Five-Year Plans, was applied to every corner of the country. Great electric power stations were erected in the Caucasus, in Central Asia, in the Far East and in the North. Geological expeditions surveyed every corner of the vast land, revealing riches beneath the earth unknown to exist in Tsarist times. As the Five-Year Plans came into operation mines were opened up, iron and steel plants started, machine building begun in every part of the country. Cotton was milled at its source and began to feed the new textile factories in Central Asia as well as those long established in Central Russia. The barren tundra came to life and lost tribes were reclaimed for civilization as the Northern Sea Route opened up these regions to communication with the rest of the country and industries rose on the frozen soil.

As industry began to turn out sufficient quantities of machinery for agriculture, the program of collectivization also reached every corner of the land, and tractors and combines began to plow virgin soil that had never even known the primitive wooden plow still used widely in Russia at the time of the Revolution.

Schools, colleges, scientific institutes rose everywhere, where for the first time, people could learn in their own tongue. Soon every republic had its own corps of skilled workers, engineers, scientists, artists and writers, statesmen. People that had had no written language now were producing newspapers, magazines, books by the million. Their ancient folk music was scored, and woven into operas. Their wandering musicians and bards became Honored Artists of the Republic. From Moscow, theatrical troupes visited the towns of the national minorities, sharing with them the rich cultural life of the center. And to the great annual folk festivals in Moscow came Tatars, Kirghiz, Kazaks, Turcomen, Uzbeks, to spread the glowing fabric of their folk art before their Russian brothers.

The main effort from the beginning was to release the latent potentialities of the native people themselves, to give them a chance to learn to run their own governments and industries, to develop their own

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cultural heritage. Local customs were respected, local aspirations given the opportunity for expression and realization. Each of the many nations making up the Soviet Union had voluntarily chosen for itself the socialist basis of society, and had voluntarily chosen to be a part of the Soviet Union, so that there were no conflicts between the needs of the center and the needs of the periphery, that could not be resolved. "National in form and socialist in content," was the accepted form of their development. And the Great Russians who had formerly been their oppressors were now "the first among equals," sharing with them their greater experience and material development, and in turn being enriched by all that they had to give.

The success of the Soviet nationality policy was mirrored in the Stalinist Constitution adopted in 1936, which was no dream for the future, but an instrument recording a situation already achieved. The right to secession was retained, supported by Stalin against those who argued it was no longer necessary. For greater national representation a bicameral Supreme Soviet was established. The Council of the Union is composed of delegates of many nationalities elected by the people on the basis of one for each 300,000 inhabitants. To the Council of Nationalities, each Union Republic sends 25 deputies, irrespective of its size. The other ethnographic divisions within the larger units are represented according to their size and stage of development, *Both Chambers have equal rights.* Either or both may initiate legislation, and no law can be passed without a majority of both Chambers. The two Chambers jointly elect the presidium in which supreme authority is vested between sessions of the Supreme Soviet.

The basic provisions of the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., as well as the similar Constitutions of each of its Constituent Republics, are of course applicable equally to all citizens of every nationality. All men and women share equally the people's ownership of the land and all its resources and of the means and instruments of production their socialist system guarantees. All share equally the fundamental rights and duties of all citizens; the right to work, to rest and leisure, to social insurance, to education.

And, in addition, there is article 123:

"Equality of rights of citizens of the U.S.S.R., irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social and political life, is an indefeasible law.

"Any direct or indirect restriction of the rights of, or, conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for, citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law."

This means simply that in the U.S.S.R. *anti-Semitism, as well as any other form of national or racial antagonism, is a crime.*

How completely the concept of equality of rights of all peoples has been realized in the Soviet Union has been demonstrated in the mag-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nificent unity of the whole Soviet people as they have fought together in this great patriotic war for the liberation of their socialist fatherland and for world-wide national liberation. This unity was what impressed Wendell Willkie above all else on his visit to the U.S.S.R. in 1942. After a visit to the front he wrote: "I realized more clearly than ever before that in Russia the phrase, 'This is a people's war,' has real meaning."

The Soviet nationalities policy has reached its highest development during the war. When the four original Soviet Republics united in 1922, they delegated to the Central Government full powers in foreign relations and in matters of defense. But even at that time, Stalin indicated the possibility of extending the powers of the separate Republics in these spheres under a different world situation. That change has come about and was sealed at Teheran, where the principle of cooperation between the capitalist democracies and the socialist democracy was firmly established. The extension of the powers of the sixteen Union Republics in military and foreign affairs is a natural and historical development of the consistent Soviet national policy. The provision that each republic may maintain direct diplomatic relations with other countries opens up every section of the vast area of the U.S.S.R. to new contacts with other nations and so broadens the whole base of post-war cooperation.

The absurdity of the attempts to make this extension of democracy appear as a maneuver to "secure sixteen votes at the peace table" or to prepare for the "Sovietization of Europe" must now be apparent to at least some of the authors of such statements.

All recent American visitors to the Soviet Union have been especially impressed by the extraordinary progress of all the Soviet minority peoples. Eric Johnston, amazed to find the age of science flourishing in Uzbekistan, was moved to offer a toast in a Tashkent factory to "the tremendous progress made here in the last twenty years under the Soviet system." W. H. Lawrence, *New York Times* correspondent who traveled with him, wrote in his dispatch of the two Central Asiatic Republics of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan that "more progress has been made in the years since Soviet rule was firmly established here than in all the other years since Alexander the Great first captured Samarkand in 329 B.C."

Vice-President Wallace commented enthusiastically on the new industry and new life and above all the new free people he found in Siberia on his visit last spring. Owen Lattimore, who accompanied him, noted especially the flexibility of the Soviet national policy. In a recent article in the *Far Eastern Survey*, Mr. Lattimore made a penetrating analysis of the difference in status between minority groups in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, where minority rights tend to be largely identified with the right to nonconformity. This, he said, sometimes led Americans to ask: "What would happen if one of these Soviet minorities were to attempt to set up laws,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

institutions and practices conflicting with Marxist doctrines and Soviet orthodoxy?" Mr. Lattimore answers thus:

". . . This would be the last thing that would occur to their minds, not the first. All of them have a long history of oppression. Since, in all their long history, only the Soviet government ever freed them from discrimination and gave them the opportunity of progress, they identify their own interest with the Soviet interest, and in everything which they do to advance their own particular interest their instinct is also to advance the general Soviet interest, not to encroach upon it, because the general Soviet interest is the primary safeguard of their own particular interest."

Foreign Relations with Small Countries

The principle that underlies the relations of the family of nations within the Soviet Union also determines her relations with the small countries outside her borders. The application of the principle is of necessity different, because the relations are different. Within, cooperation has assumed its most complete form, because the Soviet Republics have voluntarily subordinated themselves to a central federal government which in turn has assumed great responsibilities in relation to them. But the principle of the right of nations to self-determination—expressed more accurately as the right to independent political existence—is completely operative in Soviet relations to outside states. Thus, the Soviet Union has consistently sought peaceful and friendly relations with other states and a system of collective security, as the only guarantee that nations could be independent.

One of her first acts in foreign relations was to cancel all unequal treaties that had given Russia special privileges in regard to other nations. After the last World War, the Soviet Union sought, through a series of non-aggression pacts, to establish friendly relations with all the nations along her borders. She was the first to sign the Kellogg-Briand pact outlawing war, and to put it into effect with her neighbor nations. In the League of Nations, the Soviet Union consistently championed the small nations who were first to become the victims of fascist aggression—Ethiopia, Spain, Austria, Czechoslovakia.

But instead of taking the road of collective security against fascist aggression, the reactionary governments then in power took the road of appeasement that led to war. The entry of the Soviet Union and subsequently the United States into the war, finally brought into being the great coalition of the democracies against Hitler. In uniting against the fascist countries, the democracies, led by the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition, undertook the liberation of the small nations that had been the victims of the appeasement policy. And so the issue of self-determination, of political independence of all nations, became a cardinal point in United Nations policy.

Let us trace the development of this principle as expressed in the pronouncements of the leaders of the three great countries.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On July 3, 1941, in his address to the Soviet people after the German attack, Stalin said:

"In this war of liberation we shall not be alone. In this great war we shall have loyal allies in the people of Europe and America, including the German people who are enslaved by the Hitlerite despots.

"Our war for the freedom of our country will merge with the struggle of the peoples of Europe and America for their independence, for democratic liberties."

On August 14, 1941, Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt agreed on certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries, and issued the Atlantic Charter, whose first three points were these:

"1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

"2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

"3. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

On November 6, 1941, Stalin again expressed Soviet war aims in these words:

"We have not and cannot have such war aims as the seizure of foreign territories, the subjugation of foreign peoples, regardless of whether it concerns peoples and territories of Europe or peoples and territories of Asia, including Iran. Our first aim consists in liberating our territory and our peoples from the German fascist yoke.

"We have not and cannot have such war aims as imposing our will and our regime on the Slavs and other enslaved peoples of Europe who are awaiting our aid. Our aid consists in assisting these peoples in their liberation struggle against Hitler tyranny and then setting them free to rule on their own land as they desire. No intervention whatever in the internal affairs of other peoples!"

On January 1, 1942, America, England, the Soviet Union and all the other United Nations joined together in a declaration which recorded their acceptance of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

In the Four-Power Moscow Declaration of October 30, 1943, the Foreign Ministers of the Soviet Union, England, the United States and China agreed:

". . . That they recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving States, and open to membership by all such States, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security."

And finally, the great Concord of Teheran on December 1, 1943, in which President Roosevelt, Premier Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill expressed their joint determination to work together in the war and in the peace that will follow; to make a peace that will "banish the scourge and terror of war for many generations." Their agree-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment on this program for the future was expressed in the declaration:

"We shall seek the cooperation and active participation of all nations, large and small, whose peoples in heart and in mind are dedicated, as are our own peoples, to the elimination of tyranny and slavery, oppression and intolerance. We will welcome them as they choose to come into the world family of democratic nations."

In these statements, we can see the merging of the struggle of all the United Nations for national liberation into one great single war. In them we can see the great unifying principle of self-determination of nations. In these joint aims with its allies, and in the day-to-day actions of the Soviet Government, as its armies, in coordination with the allied armies, liberate the countries of Europe, Soviet war and post-war policies shine out as clearly as the noon-day sun.

Above all else, the first object is to smash Hitler Germany in the shortest possible time—and for good. Every other concern is subordinate to that one. No nation can dream of independence until that threat is decisively eliminated from the world. The Red Armies enter the territory of other lands as liberators, not invaders, as was made clear by Molotov's statement the moment Soviet troops crossed the borders of the U.S.S.R. They do not interfere in the internal affairs of other states except to the extent of helping them to get rid of the enemy and those of their own people who are serving the enemy. Everywhere they help to liberate the people's forces so that they may work out their own destiny. Nowhere do they try to force their ideology or institutions on anyone else.

Naturally they are concerned that the neighboring small countries have governments that will be friendly, not hostile, to the Soviet Union. This, too, is a guarantee of independence. *No government of a small country close to the Soviet Union would be hostile to the Soviet Union on its own account.* Any government truly representing the interests of its people would understand the importance of friendly relations with their great neighbor. The whole history of Soviet foreign policy demonstrates both her desire for friendly relations with her neighbors and the mutual advantages of such relations. Thus, a hostile government could only be one that was the tool of some other power which wanted to make use of it in opposing the Soviet Government, and such a neighbor country would hence be in constant danger of being used as a *place d'armes* against the U.S.S.R.

The Leading Anti-Hitler Coalition

It is clear that only the Big Three, with their mighty land, sea and air power actually have the power to stop aggression. It is they who today are delivering the mighty coordinated blows that are vanquishing the world's Number One enemy, giving them immense prestige among all the peoples who owe their freedom to them. It is clear that their continued alliance

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and friendship are essential to maintain the peace after the war. That the core of the new international security organization should be based on the agreement of this leading anti-Hitler coalition is not to deny the rights of small nations. It is to guarantee those rights. No world peace structure would be viable that was not based on such a complete and stable agreement.

The Soviet Union has made clear her unbending will for continued unity and peace. Thus any split in the alliance could only be brought about by forces wanting war with the Soviet Union. Joined with these three on the permanent "Security Council" of the projected United Nations organization, will be China, and, in due course, France. In reaching this decision, the Dumbarton Oaks conference wisely avoided a cumbersome type of Council such as proposed by Sumner Welles, based on a spurious kind of democracy and predicated on the dangerous assumption that agreement among the Big Three will not be durable. The Dumbarton Oaks plan also repudiates any idea like the regional "Community" groupings proposed by Walter Lippmann, virtually representing a world *cordon sanitaire* against the Soviet Union, which would lead to war, not peace. Regional groupings to some extent there may be, but they must be groupings within and buttressing the general structure, and not in opposition to the whole or any of its parts.

The lip service that Governor Dewey and his foreign affairs adviser, John Foster Dulles, are now paying to the international organization of peace, should not obscure the long record of both of them in opposition to this idea, nor the fact that it is from the ranks of Dewey's backers that we hear the loudest reiteration of the Big Lies, designed to destroy international cooperation, about Soviet policies as well as our own Administration's policies.

One of the biggest of these is about a "deal," presumably "turning over" the Baltic states to the Soviet Union. But the Baltic states are no one's to turn over. The Baltic states belong only to their own people, and their own people have chosen that they be a part of the Soviet Union. They were a part of Russia in the past, and all their natural economic ties were with that country. Their people's revolutions were put down with the help of German arms after the last war. Their independence was recognized first of all by the Soviet Union. But their independence proved fictitious. In the name of their own independence they were utilized by the powers to try to destroy the independence of the U.S.S.R. They became fascist puppets. When at last in 1939 they had elections, their people voted overwhelmingly to enter the Soviet Union. Their brief years as Soviet Republics was the only taste of freedom, independence and progress they ever had. The Baltic states are not negotiable. They are a part of the Soviet family of nations.

Finland, of course, according to Bullitt and the rest of the anti-So-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viet crew, is going to be swallowed by the Soviet Union.

Finland is, in fact, an outstanding example of the scrupulous application of the Soviet policy of self-determination. In January, 1918, the independence which Kerensky had refused was granted to Finland by the Soviet Government. The strong Finnish people's movement was drowned in blood by Baron Mannerheim with German help, and Finland, too, in the years that followed, became a center of anti-Soviet intrigue, a pawn in the hands of the reactionary governments then preparing war on the Soviet Union, who almost succeeded in 1940 in switching the war. When the U.S.S.R. won the winter war into which they were forced in self-defense, not against Finland alone, but against those preparing to use her as a *place d'armes,* a generous peace was concluded. Finland gave up only the minimum territory near Leningrad essential to Soviet security, and received a much larger area in return. Even though military danger still remained, there was no move toward annexation. For the words of Stalin in relation to Finland in April, 1917, were just as true of Soviet poilcy in March, 1940—and in October, 1944:

"It is intolerable that we should endorse the forcible retention of any people whatsoever within the bounds of one state."

In spite of the criminal prolongation by the Finnish leaders of the peace negotiations, the final armistice terms, signed jointly with England, were very moderate. This was further proof that the U.S.S.R. has no desire to dominate Finland. Although Finland was an ally of Hitler, although Finnish artillery had murdered the inhabitants of Leningrad for months (where more lives were lost than at Stalingrad), although Finnish fascist soldiers have inflicted terrible atrocities on the Soviet people, the Soviet Union insisted only that the Germans be driven out, pro-Hitler groups suspended, and on the minimum territorial adjustments necessary for Soviet—and Allied—security. Reparation payments, which had originally been set at only half the actual damage done by the Finns, were halved again, demonstrating a desire to keep Finland's economic life from collapsing and her independence secure.

The Polish situation, because of the many complex elements in it and the reactionary character of the Polish Government-in-Exile, is the one on which the enemies of the Soviet Union—and of the United Nations—count most heavily in their last-ditch efforts to split the allies. Every move of the U.S.S.R. has been in the direction of helping Poland to regain her independence, and of releasing the democratic forces within Poland who alone could give that independence meaning. Stalin and the other Soviet leaders have said over and over again that they are for a strong, independent and democratic Poland, including all the territory to which Poland has just claim. They have equipped a great Polish army in the Soviet Union which has been fighting with the Red Army before

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Warsaw, where thousands of Soviet citizens are dying for the freedom of Poland.

The Polish Government-in-Exile in London is so bitterly anti-Soviet that it actually took the road of collusion with Hitler in the Katyn affair which led the Soviet Union to break relations with it. It does not represent the Polish people. Poland's semi-fascist leaders abandoned their country to its fate after the Nazi invasion. The émigrés who gathered together in London and called themselves "Poland" had no mandate from their people. They draw their spurious powers from the dictatorial and illegal Pilsudsky constitution of 1935 which abolished free elections. Their "President" Raczkiewicz, is the third in succession holding office simply on appointment by the preceding President. The Polish people never had any voice in the matter. This group of imposters has acted with criminal disregard of the will and interests and lives of the Polish people. They were willing to gamble away the lives of 250,000 people in Warsaw in the premature rising they called for political capital, without coordinating this action with the Red Army. The main conflict is not between the Soviet Union and the Polish Government-in-Exile, but between the Polish people and a small minority representing the old semi-fascist landlord-ruled clique already discarded by history—and by the Polish people.

The National Committee of Polish Liberation, on the other hand, basing itself on the democratic Polish Constitution of 1921, is made up chiefly of Poles who have been fighting the Germans from within Poland, with Ossubka-Morawski as President until elections can be held. Its twenty members, of whom three are Communists, represent a coalition of all the Polish anti-fascist forces. They are friendly to the Soviet Government because they know how greatly the Polish people need that friendship. As soon as the Red Armies entered Polish territory the Soviet Union concluded an agreement with the Polish Committee of National Liberation whereby the latter administers all liberated territory. The P.C.N.L. is restoring democratic liberties, instituting agrarian reforms, re-establishing industry, reviving educational and cultural activities.

In order to avoid all possibility of dissident minorities on either side of the border, the principle of self-determination has been further extended by an agreement of the Byelo-Russian and Ukrainian Soviet Republics with the P.C.N.L. for interchange of populations. The minority of Polish nationality in the districts that have become part of the U.S.S.R. may, if they wish, cross over to the Polish side of the border and become Polish citizens, while Byelo-Russians and Ukrainians in Poland may, if they so desire, join their ethnic brothers and become Soviet citizens. Substantial economic aid is provided to anyone taking advantage of this arrangement. A similar agreement has been made between the Lithuanian Soviet Republic and the P.C.N.L.

Despite the anti-Soviet record of the Polish government-in-exile, the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Union, in the interests of the greatest possible unity, has left no stone unturned to aid in a reconciliation of the Exile Government's more moderate elements with the Polish Committee of National Liberation.

Liberators, Not Conquerors

Quite different from the policy of the Polish Government-in-Exile has been that of the Czechoslovakian Government. President Benes and other members of his government were democratically elected to office by the Czechoslovakian people and have continued to serve the interests of their people. They know that friendly relations with their great neighbor are the *sine qua non* of future peace and stability. President Benes has frequently reminded the world that the Soviet Union was ready to stand by the mutual aid pact even when the France of Bonnet and Daladier refused to fulfill its conditions and instead became party to the shameful Munich agreement which turned Czechoslovakia over to Hitler. Thereafter, as President Benes has testified, Czechoslovakia's faith in the Soviet Union never wavered. After Hitler's attack on the U.S.S.R. in 1941, diplomatic relations were established with the Czechoslovakian Government in London, Czechoslovakian units were formed to fight on the Soviet front, and in December, 1943, a mutual aid pact was signed between Czechoslovakia and the U.S.S.R., open also to adherence by Poland, and buttressing the agreement of Teheran.

Today, as the Red Army begins the liberation of Czechoslovakia, representatives of the Czechoslovakian Government follow on its heels, ready, by agreement with the Soviet Union, to take over the administration of their own country under their own laws just as soon as any part of it ceases to be the zone of actual war operations.

When on March 26 the Red Army reached the frontier of the U.S.S.R. and was ordered to pursue the enemy into Roumanian territory, Foreign Minister Molotov declared that the Soviet Government "does not pursue the purpose of acquiring any part of Roumanian territory or of changing the social system existing in Roumania."

All the correspondents who entered Roumania in the wake of the Red Army testified to the scrupulous way in which the Red Army officers and men refrained from any interference beyond what was necessary for military security. And yet their very presence changed everything. Jews walked the streets freely again, without fear. Trade union organizations, suppressed for many years, were revived. The people began to run their own affairs.

Today Roumania has driven out its fascist dictators. Antonescu and the other war criminals have been apprehended, and will be brought to justice at the scene of their crimes in the U.S.S.R. Roumania today, fighting beside the Allies, has a National Democratic Front Government deriving its powers from Roumania's previous constitution, now restored until a Constituent Assembly can meet and draft a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

new one. Armistice negotiations were concluded in Moscow with representatives of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States. According to the armistice terms, published at once, Bessarabia and North Bukovina are returned to the U.S.S.R., and Roumania receives help from the Soviet Union in recovering Transylvania from Hungary. The terms of the armistice are to be carried out by an Allied Control Commission acting under the general direction of the Soviet High Command. Roumanian civil administration will be restored as rapidly as possible. All fascist organizations on Roumanian territory, whether political or military, are to be dissolved, as well as other organizations conducting propaganda hostile to the United Nations, in particular the Soviet Union. *All discriminatory legislation and racial restrictions are repealed.*

The coup that brought the new government into being was engineered with the help of young King Michael, a number of army generals headed by Sanatescu (now premier) who established connections with the then illegal Communist Party, which had already entered into common action with the Social-Democratic Party. They were joined by an alliance formed among the Liberal and National Peasant Parties and all other labor and anti-Hitler organizations. These elements are all represented in the new government. That all is not running with complete smoothness is to be expected. The important thing is that the inclusion of all these elements in the government and the degree of unity already achieved open the way for the establishment of Roumanian democracy for the first time in history.

Bulgaria likewise is now fighting Germany at the side of the allies. Because of the immense popularity of the Soviet Union among the Bulgarian people, its pro-German leaders feared to send their army into the war on the Eastern Front. When, in its negotiations with the other Allies to get out of the war, it became apparent that Bulgaria was temporizing, offering the Allies a spurious neutrality while actually protecting German troops, the Soviet Union acted realistically and decisively and declared war. As a result, within four days the Bulgarian people had put into power a strong popular government of the underground Fatherland Front elements, headed by Kimon Georgiev as Premier and Demyan Velchev as War Minister, both members of the Zveno group (the anti-fascist Republican Officers League) which had long opposed the Boris dictatorship and the regency that followed. Communists, Socialists and Left Agrarians are also represented in the new government, which is committed to democratic reforms.

Everywhere in Europe the heroic people's resistance movements have aided the advance of the Allied armies. Nowhere was that movement more highly developed or more effective than in Yugoslavia, where for over three years Marshal Tito and his people's liberation movement fought not only the Germans but the forces of the traitor Mikhailovich, and wrested from

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the enemy a large section of their country.

Long before the other Allies were ready to give recognition to the real people's liberation movement in Yugoslavia, headed by Marshal Tito, the treacherous role of Mikhailovich was fully understood by the Soviet Union. At the same time, the Soviet Union was careful not to let this issue interfere with the United Nations unity. The situation was finally resolved, with general Allied approval, by the formation of a new united Government-in-Exile with King Peter's agreement, headed by Ivan Subasich and including members of Marshal Tito's government within Yugoslavia. The question of the monarchy was postponed until after the war for solution by the people themselves. The traitor General Mikhailovich was dropped. In the agreement between the two groups the principle of a federal Yugoslavia based on the equality of the Serb, Croat and Slovene nations was recognized, each of these nations receiving representation in the new government. The Red Army entered Yugoslavian territory by agreement with Marshal Tito, has already made junction with his forces, and has fought its way into the territory of Hitler's last satellite, Hungary.

So, everywhere, in its relations with small nations, the policy of the Soviet Union is the same.

First, in firm alliance with its allies, pursuing the strategy and aims of the full coalition warfare agreed upon at Teheran, the utter and complete rout of the enemy in the shortest possible space of time.

Second, apprehension and trial of all war criminals and help in the elimination of all fascist and collaborationist elements within each nation, so that the people's forces will be free to restore democratic liberties and develop the political independence of their own nation according to their own special forms and aspirations.

Third, while the war is still in progress, to work out, in cooperation with its allies, as in the conference at Dumbarton Oaks, the main outlines of a world system which will guarantee future security to all nations.

Fourth, also while the war is still in progress, participation in international conferences on food, relief, financial and trade problems, to work out plans for the necessary material aid to the war-ravaged countries and the post-war economic collaboration necessary to avoid depressions and to secure to small nations the economic base essential for their independence.

The Road to Enduring Peace

In this great war of the United Nations for national liberation, many wars have been merged into one war, many long-term problems are being solved in the course of the war itself. The great outstanding fact in Europe today is the emergence of the people's forces as the determining factor in the restoration of national political life. In all the liberated countries the reactionary and fascist elements whose stranglehold on the people would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eventually have led to a whole series of civil wars, are being driven from power.

Since these aims are being achieved in the course of the war itself, and the old imperialist relations between large nations and small are being largely eliminated in the process, it is above all necessary to maintain peace and stability after the war so that the united peoples' governments now rising everywhere may consolidate their power, not be weakened by new conflicts from which only the reactionary elements could gain. Many difficulties still lie ahead. But a great historic step forward has been made, and the Soviet Union has shown her determination to contribute her great strength toward the maintenance of peace and stability.

The only guarantee that the small nations can remain independent and not again become pawns in a new game of power politics leading to a new world war, is the new world organization already in the making for the maintenance of peace, in which all democratic nations will participate. The United States, England, the Soviet Union and China have been pledged by their leaders to such a course. At this historic moment the people of the world look to us to see whether, by the re-election of President Roosevelt, America can be counted on to fulfill her part in reaching the great goals set at Teheran.

And within that great coalition, the friendship of America and the Soviet Union is assuming ever greater importance. There are special points of similarity and mutual interests drawing us ever closer together. There are growing bonds between our peoples in every walk of life—in labor, in culture, in science, in trade. In her great reconstruction tasks, the Soviet Union looks to us for aid. In our great post-war need of markets to keep our wartime industries in operation, converted to peace-time needs, we look to the Soviet Union. The enduring friendship of the peoples of the United States and the U.S.S.R. is the best guarantee of the enduring friendship of all free peoples.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

BY A. LANDY

I

ON November 7, the peoples of the Soviet Union will celebrate the 27th anniversary of the great October Revolution—the Revolution which enabled their country to emerge as a modern state whose heroic stature and achievements place it forever among the great nations of world history and whose contributions to the salvation of world freedom have earned for it the eternal gratitude of all progressive mankind. If the Soviet peoples, despite unprecedented losses and endless sacrifices, have been able to withstand and repel the concentrated might of the most barbarous and powerful aggressor of all times, it is only because the Socialist Revolution of October 1917 created the material, social and cultural conditions which unlocked the wellsprings of national greatness and permitted the emergence of the dynamic leadership, the organizational genius, the military skill and the spiritual resources necessary for survival and victory.

An Historic Year

A year ago, at the time of its 26th anniversary, the Soviet Union had the honor of recording the decisive turn in the whole war; the symbol of that turn was immortal Stalingrad, an eternal monument to the human spirit fighting for freedom and progress. Today, the third year of the war for the Soviet peoples, they have every reason to really celebrate on the occasion of the birthday of their freedom, and the whole world will celebrate with them. For the Nazi invaders are now being cleared from the last foot of Soviet soil; the anti-Hitler coalition of America, the Soviet Union and Great Britain has been tempered and strengthened in the fires of coalition warfare; the first practical steps for the organization of lasting peace have already been taken at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks; and the war in Europe is approaching its culmination as the Grand Alliance prepares to open the final, combined offensive which will completely overwhelm Nazi Germany. The Hitlerites, shorn of their satellites, their European "New Order" in ruins, and the reserves which they still had a year ago exhausted, have lost their last frantic gamble to prolong the war,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

divide the Allies, and save themselves from total defeat.

The year that has passed has witnessed truly historic milestones along the road to victory and lasting peace: the epochal Teheran Conference, the great Allied invasion of Western Europe, the invincible Soviet summer offensive which carried the Red Army from the Dnieper to the Vistula, the elimination of Roumania, Finland, Bulgaria and now Hungary from Hitler's ranks, the liberation of France and Belgium, the assault on the Nazis' Westwall, the advance in Holland to outflank the Nazis from the north, the slow but steady advance in Italy, the juncture of the Yugoslav Liberation forces with the Red Army, the clearing of the Balkans and the Baltic and the beginning of the final Soviet offensive on Germany itself. The Nazi beast has been driven into his lair, and as the United Nations proceed to destroy him, they are completing their plans for enduring peace. They have laid the foundations for a stable world order in the monetary and security organization conferences in the United States, they have prepared the victory over Japan in the Roosevelt-Churchill conference at Quebec and they have resolved some of the key unsettled problems of Europe in the Churchill-Stalin conference at Moscow. The past year has been truly a year of testing for the Grand Alliance, and the verdict of events is that it has worked.

Growth of American-Soviet Friendship

What is of particular importance to the American people is that these events have simultaneously registered the development of a more active and fruitful cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union. Indeed, as noted by Pierre Cot, a good friend of the United States and the Soviet Union, who has just returned from a mission to the U.S.S.R. on behalf of the Provisional French Government: "Since Teheran, the rapprochement of these two powers has been the dominant factor in international policies. Their friendship will be a great force for peace." (*The Nation*, Oct. 7, 1944.)

The theory of accidental partnership with the land of Socialism, to be terminated the day after victory over the common enemy, a theory so dangerous to America's national interests, has lost whatever hold it may have had upon the majority of patriotic Americans. It has become the exclusive stock-in-trade of that reactionary minority to whom victory is synonymous with American imperialist domination of the world and will pass into the painful memories of history together with this antiquated minority.

As a matter of fact, the idea of an enduring alliance between the United States and the Soviet Union has become a basic premise of American national policy. Having emerged as a national necessity, registered in historic agreements at the Moscow and Teheran Conferences and at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks, the idea of American-Soviet collaboration and alliance has quickly become a national concept. Indeed, the United States

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannot pursue a national policy in the interest of American security and prosperity unless it is based on the premise of American-Soviet friendship and collaboration. Such collaboration is not in contradiction to Anglo-American cooperation. But a purely Anglo-Saxon orientation, as a substitute for Soviet-American cooperation, is as outmoded today, following the world changes arising out of the war, as the conditions which inspired such an orientation during the nineteenth and early part of the twentieth centuries. On the contrary, Soviet-American friendship and collaboration will bulwark the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition on the continuation of which depend the welfare and peace of the new world arising out of victory in the war.

The emergence of close ties between the United States and the Soviet Union has been the most important development in the history of the foreign relations of our nation. Our security depends upon effective alliances; our prosperity depends upon a stable world; and our democratic development will unquestionably be affected by the character of our relations with the new democratic countries of Europe and especially with the most powerful power on that continent. As long as America remembers Pearl Harbor, it will remember that isolation and the absence of effective alliances did not spare us from unprovoked attack. And remembering this, it will value even more highly its friendship with the Soviet Union. The time is past when advocacy of American-Soviet collaboration on a policy of collective security was confined largely to Communist circles. Especially during the past year, the bonds of sympathy and understanding between the two peoples, notably in the ranks of labor, have grown immeasurably. Today some of the most articulate advocates of such collaboration are the spokesmen of American big capital who have outgrown their prejudice against cooperation with the land of Socialism and have refused to fall for Hitler's Bolshevik bogey.

The Answer Depends on the People

Eric Johnston, President of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, reporting on his recent talk with Premier Stalin, put the heart of the question in a few words. Stalin, he said, told him: "Foolish Hitler has done one good thing. He has brought the American people and the Russian people together. We must never allow anything to come between us again. We must work together after the war." And Johnson adds: "I reflected that when peace comes, Russia and the United States will be the two strongest nations in the world, possessing the larger share of the world's military and industrial power. Yes, Stalin was right. War has brought us together. But the sand traps of many difficult problems lie ahead. Will we be able to stay on the fairways of cooperation and friendship after we have crushed our common enemy? The destiny of the world may be at stake in that answer."

II

The day on which the Soviet peo-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ples will celebrate their 27th anniversary is also the day on which the American people will make a fateful decision on the leadership and course of our nation for the whole next period of history. The connection between these two events is more than just a coincidence of dates. Actually, the vote for President will also amount to a national estimate by the majority of the American people of the significance of the Soviet peoples for our own peace, security and prosperity.

For the issue in this campaign is: Will we continue to work together with our Allies for peace, prosperity and enlarging democracy, or will we embark upon a program of utilizing America's vast resources and power to gain imperialist domination of the world? Or more precisely: Will the democratic majority which stands solidly behind President Roosevelt and his policies allow a reactionary minority to take power and lead our country down the road which can only culminate in World War Number Three? There is no question as to the answer of the overwhelming majority of Americans. The only question is: Will they make it effective at the polls on November 7?

Dewey Raises the Issue

The action of the American people on November 7 cannot avoid the effect of a national mandate regarding our relations with the Soviet people in the post-war world. It cannot, for the simple reason that the forces sponsoring Dewey's candidacy, in challenging the whole policy of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition which is the premise of victory and lasting peace, have attempted to fight and win the election on a rejection of this course and, for this purpose, have concentrated on the Soviet Union as their chief target.

It is amazing, but nonetheless a fact, that, at the very moment when on a world scale, the United Nations, having refused to be divided by Hitler's bogey of the bolshevization of the globe, are exerting their greatest efforts jointly to destroy the Hitler beast in his lair, the most reactionary section of capital in the United States is conducting the struggle for power in the election on Hitler's chief slogan of anti-Communism! The significance of this, in a country which will be the keystone of the entire post-war world structure, is not being lost on the peoples of Europe, and certainly not on the Soviet peoples. To the rest of the world, which has paid dearly for its wisdom, this spectacle, accompanied by the familiar trappings of lies, deceit and demagogy, can have only one, ominous meaning —that the Dewey forces would use their control of the Government (1) to break up the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition for victory and peace, for the fulfillment of the Teheran program; (2) to prevent the maximum development of Soviet-American friendship and relations within the framework of a world security organization; and (3) to replace these by a unilateral policy of American imperialist domination of the world. That is why, on

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

November 7, the American people will have to choose not just between two candidates, but between two historical perspectives, two paths of development.

The argument, of course, has been made, even by some supporters of President Roosevelt, that the attack on Communism by the Dewey camp is of purely domestic significance and has nothing whatever to do with their plans regarding American-Soviet relations in the post-war world. It is obviously fruitless to argue with people who are so politically naive, or rather, who expect others to be so politically naive, as to believe that, under the present conditions, there can possibly be such a separation and division between domestic and foreign policy. The only significance of such an argument is its practical effect in helping to whitewash and cover up the real character of the Dewey program and to confuse the historical issue in this crucial election.

The fact is that the crusade of the anti-Soviet forces in the United States has reached its highest peak in this election campaign around the candidacy of Dewey. Far from repudiating this anti-Sovet crusade, at a time when American-Soviet relations have the most decisive bearing on world history, Dewey's program and perspectives constitute the practical driving force behind this crusade. The special significance of this fact is that the anti-Soviet crusade is taking the form of a struggle for government power—the government power of a country whose policies and position are bound to determine the course of all nations at least for the next generation.

The Anti-Soviet Crusade

It must be emphasized, of course, that the anti-Soviet crusade is not just directed against our relations with the Soviet Union, but against the whole policy of democratic, cooperative relations with all of our Allies for the common planning of a stable world and an abiding peace. It is directed not only against this foreign policy but also against its counterpart in domestic policy. It has dedicated itself to the task of preventing the emergence of the new world relations and democratic perspectives growing out of the war. And if it assumes a predominantly anti-Soviet form, it is largely because our relations with the Soviet Union represent the key to these new historical perspectives.

The line of this crusade can be seen from a glance at some of the chief "arguments" that have been advanced on behalf of Dewey's election.

1. *The attempt to make Communism the issue* in the campaign by charging that "the Roosevelt Administration is part of a gigantic plot to sell our democracy out to the Communists." President Roosevelt put his finger on the essence of this line when he declared that "this form of fear propaganda is not new among rabble rousers and fomenters of class hatred—who seek to destroy democracy itself. It was used by Mussolini's Blackshirts and by Hitler's Brownshirts." (Radio speech of Oct. 5, 1944.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. *The fraudulent attack on "secret diplomacy"* and the effort to discredit every practical step by the Anglo-Soviet-American Coalition toward victory and lasting peace (Teheran, Bretton Woods, Dumbarton Oaks). The aparent difference between Dewey and Bricker on this matter is purely an ill-concealed division of labor for campaign purposes.

The same Dewey who was later compelled formally to greet the Dumbarton Oaks plan for a world security organization had sought to prevent the Conference by assailing proposals for post-war security as cynical power politics and by expressing fears that the United States, Britain, Russia and China are planning permanent domination of the world (Aug. 16).

What Dewey had in mind was explained two days later by Senator Robert A. Taft who declared that he was 100 per cent for the statement of Thomas E. Dewey, and expressed belief that "Dewey was hitting at anticipated Russian requests for a 20-year military alliance with the United States, similar to a Russian English Pact." (*Ohio State Journal*, Aug. 18, 1944.)

Later, Mr. Aldrich, another Dewey backer and President of the Chase National Bank, provided additional insight into the real character of Dewey's objections. *According to Mr. Aldrich, each country should work out its various problems separately with the United States.* Needless to say, such an approach is diametrically opposed to the spirit and policy which made the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks Conferences possible, and accounts for the efforts to discredit these conferences with the shabby argument that the President is giving America away behind secret diplomacy. To imperialist-minded men who want to dominate the world, any mutual benefit policy of international collaboration is tantamount to giving away what should belong to America by virtue of its economic power, and hence, to giving away America itself.

3. *The spurious "small nation" appeal,* attacking the Four-Power effort to establish a world security organization, in the name of protecting the small nations. Knowing full well that the only guarantee of a lasting peace can be the cooperation of the *major* powers who possess the overwhelming military might of the world, the projection of the small nations issue by the Dewey forces is an obvious piece of campaign demagogy. Its purpose is evident from the fact that the "small nations" so eagerly defended by the Dewey camp are nations which are part of or bordering on the Soviet Union. By casting doubts and suspicions on the aims and intentions of the Soviet Union, they hope to undermine or prevent the development of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition.

The Polish question seemed as if made to order for this purpose; it seemed to restore the opportunities which they lost when "poor little Finland" was forced out of the war. The Dewey forces have lavished time and money on the exploitation of the "Polish issue" and no election trick has been too cheap to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

use, as for example, keeping President Roosevelt's message from being read to the Pulaski Day parade in New York City while Governor Dewey was rushed from his train to make an anti-Soviet declaration on Poland. Unfortunately, these champions of "small nations" are in danger of losing Poland also as their *cause celebre* through the Churchill-Stalin Conference in Moscow which is attempting to settle the issue once and for all.

4. *The repeated insinuation that the Soviet Union is not sincerely cooperating with the Anglo-American allies in this war;* that the Soviet Union is the obstacle to international organization to prevent future wars; and that, despite this, President Roosevelt is allowing the Soviet Union a free hand. While the Polish question has served as the main vehicle for peddling this insinuation, the "pet" has been the war with Japan.

5. *The further insinuation that this war will be followed by a third world war against the Soviet Union* because of the alleged threat of Soviet domination and aggression. On this, there is complete unanimity throughout the entire Dewey camp. This has been the favorite theme of the Hearst - Patterson - McCormick press, an example of which is the two-column spread by Carl H. von Wiegand entitled "Red Stalin Rise Perils White Race" in Hearst's *New York Journal-American* of Oct. 3.

The really big gun on this was fired by the Republican National Committee in the form of an article by William C. Bullitt which appeared in the September 4 issue of *Life* magazine, the Republican organ of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Luce. This article by an "eminent authority," timed to harm the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, was intended to convince America that Europe is menaced by the Bolsheviks, that they have been given a free hand by President Roosevelt, and that it will be necessary for America and Britain to fight against the Soviet Union fifteen years hence.

The von Wiegand article in the Hearst press ended with the declaration that "At the end of this conflict the British people will have had enough of war for a time, and will not go to war to stop Marshal Josef Stalin and Soviet Russia, neither in Europe nor in Asia. Nor will America." The Bullitt article is written in the same demagogic vein, declaring that Britain will emerge from this war a very tired victor and asking, Who then will stem the Communist tide in Europe?

It is indicative of the thoroughness of the Dewey camp in disseminating this Hitlerite bogey of the Bolshevization of Europe and the inevitability of a new world war against the Soviet Union that even the language press has not been neglected. A rabid anti-Soviet campaign along the Bullitt lines is raging through the reactionary press of such groups as the Greeks, Poles, Lithuanians, Finns and others among whom the Republican high command is seeking votes for Dewey.

6. *Formally conceding the necessity of an international organization for peace,* nevertheless ad-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vancing plans and conditions which aim at isolating the Soviet Union from the family of nations and the establishment of a new *cordon sanitaire*. Such conceptions as those advanced by Walter Lipmann in his book *U. S. War Aims*, though phrased in different words from those of Bullitt, are essentially cast in the same spirit of anticipation of coming war with the Soviet Union.

III

All of these elements of the pro-Dewey election "argument" are connected by an inner logic to form a single, dominant anti-Soviet pattern. They are not merely the incidental by-products of an election campaign which can be expected to give way to a policy of genuine friendship with the Soviet Union should Dewey be elected. They represent the very essence of the policy of the reactionary social forces promoting Dewey for president. These forces do not want to see the complete destruction of fascism; they fear the complete victory of the democratic forces in the war; they have imperialist ambitions at home and abroad after the war; and consequently are opposed to the solution of world problems by means of friendly collaboration and planning on the part of the major powers. Above all, they are adamant in their determination—contrary to America's most vital national interests—to keep the Soviet Union from playing the world role which corresponds to its economic and military power as well as to its new position in the family of nations which has arisen out of the common war against fascism.

Character of Their Policy

These forces are the most reactionary sections of finance capital in the United States, supported by a rabid camp of anti-Semites, labor and Soviet baiters. Theirs is a policy of reactionary, imperialist interests in contrast to the policy of national interests, the interests of the majority of the nation which demand victory in the war, the complete destruction of fascism, national security and lasting peace, full production and employment, and democratic development—all of which depend upon the continuation of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition and the loyal fulfillment of its agreements. The fact that Dewey has found it necessary to maneuver and express verbal approval of the plan for a world security organization does not alter the reactionary horizon or the imperialist temper of the Dewey camp.

The victory of these forces would be the worst calamity for America and the world. It is inconceivable that they should succeed where Hitler failed. The American people are determined to continue and strengthen their friendship and collaboration with the great Soviet peoples. That collaboration is bringing victory over the fascist enemy and it will provide the sure foundation for post-war prosperity and abiding peace.

The Big Question

The Soviet Union, at every turn of the war, has given repeated and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

convincing evidence of its desire and its readiness to maintain and strengthen the Grand Alliance in war and peace. "The object of Soviet foreign policy," *Izvestia* recently declared, "is to smash Hitler-Germany in the shortest possible time, secure the interests of our country, eliminate war and aggression, arrange peaceful and friendly relations with all neighboring states, and secure close and secure cooperation with all democratic states, first and foremost with our great Allies, Britain and the U.S.A." The Soviet Union has made it plain that it regards the Anglo-Soviet-U. S. coalition not as a temporary association, but as an association which will endure for a long time to come and which is intended to achieve not only "complete victory over the common foe but to establish stable, lasting peace, and economic, political and social cooperation among the nations." (*PM*, Oct. 4, 1944.)

There can be no doubt about the position of the Soviet Union and the great role which it is able and ready to play in the reconstruction of the world. The big question is what role can the world expect the United States to play. And the world will look for the answer to this on November 7. One thing is clear—the United States will be able to play its full democratic role on the scale required by world history only if the American people eliminate once and for all as an influence in American public life the corroding poison of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism. The time for this is long overdue.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ORGANIZATION

BY N. MALININ

AMONG the post-war problems which require a solution, the problem of an international security organization unquestionably arouses the greatest general interest. According to general opinion, the approaching victory of the United Nations must be completed by laying the foundation of a secure and just peace and must be crowned by the creation of an international organ which will safeguard this peace against the encroachments of aggressors.

The idea of an international security organization arises from the natural desire of peoples to eliminate, if possible, armed conflict and to establish a lasting peace. The history of this idea can be traced back to the middle ages. The 14th century French writer, Pierre DuBois, Counselor of King Philip the Fair, put forward a plan for establishing an international organ. Later plans for a similar purpose were projected by the French King, Henry of Navarre, and his co-worker, Sully, by that well-known figure in American history, the founder of the State of Pennsylvania, William Penn (1693); by the French abbot, Saint Pierre (1713). The minds of Jean Jacques Rousseau; of the English philosopher, Jeremy Bentham (1786); of the leaders of the French Revolution; of the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1795); of the Russian tsar, Alexander I, were occupied by the idea of the abolition of war.

The First World War raged on a scale never before experienced. It sucked in almost all the peoples of the world. The First World War naturally gave a new stimulus to study of the problem of consolidating peace by the establishment of some type of international organization. Actually, throughout the whole period of the war of 1914-1918, in various countries (the United States, England, France, Holland, Switzerland and others), societies came into being which occupied themselves with breaking the path for that organization which was later known as the "League of Nations," and in the establishment of which President Wilson played an exceptionally active role.

The League of Nations announced that its basic aims were the safeguarding and defense of the territorial integrity and political inde-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendence of all the members of the League against any external attack and the taking of appropriate collective measures in the event of threat of danger of aggression or attacks already carried out. The League failed to fulfill these fundamental tasks from the very beginning of its existence to its last days. No measures were taken against the seizure of Vilna, the capital of Lithuania, well known to have been carried out on the orders of Pilsudski. Indeed, it subsequently approved this seizure. Similarly, the League of Nations approved the bombardment by the Italians of the Greek Island of Corfu and even forced Greece to pay an indemnity to Italy. Subsequently, it met the wishes of Japan in connection with the attack first on Manchuria and later on China; it acceded to the seizure by force of Abyssinia by Fascist Italy, to the armed intervention of Germany and Italy in the internal affairs of Spain, and to the deprivation by Germany of Austria's and Czechoslovakia's independence. Thus, the League of Nations fully demonstrated its insolvency. Its politcal bankruptcy is disputed now by no one.

* * *

The present war, which already exceeds the World War of 1914-1918 in length, devastation, and material damage, naturally has placed high on the agenda the question of establishing a new international organization having the same aims as the League, but which would be based upon principles giving greater assurance of the realization of these aims. The necessity for the establishment of such an organization was first officially recognized in the Soviet-Polish declaration signed in 1941 by Comrade Stalin and the late General Sikorski, and subsequently in the declaration of the Moscow Conference of the three Foreign Secretaries, which took place in October, 1943.

The problem of an international security organization is the subject of much attention in the contemporary political literature and also in the statements of the public men and statesmen of the United Nations. Those who write and speak on this subject usually begin their discussion, for reasons easy to understand, by analyzing the activity of the League of Nations, the defects of its structure and the mistakes which it made. Not a voice is raised to propose the preservation or resurrection of the League of Nations. The talk is of the establishment of a new organization which would be able to avoid the mistakes of the League and which would not have the deficiencies characteristic of it. However, it cannot be said that unity of thought has been displayed in the appraisal of the faults and defects of the League of Nations. Rather, a divergence of opinion is noticeable. If, for example, some see the weakness of the League in the fact that it lacked "universality," others regard the breadth of its membership as the factor which paralyzed its activities; if some complain of the inequality in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

League of large and small nations, others, on the contrary, consider that excessively broad rights were allotted to small nations; if certain persons point to the insufficiently binding character for all states of the League's decisions, in the League itself, on the other hand, voices were often raised in behalf of weakening this obligatory character.

General, indefinite accusations are often hurled against the League of Nations. Mr. Willkie, for example, stated that "the League of Nations collapsed primarily because England, France and America were determined to maintain their old imperialist policy under new conditions." Mr. Bech, Luxemburg's Minister of Foreign Affairs, discerns the cause of the League's failure in the fact that "the member states of the League were incapable of approaching the vital problems before the League from a super-national point of view." However, there are more definite criticisms of the League's defects. Above all are pointed out the necessity of unanimous decisions of questions in the League Assembly, the lack of an appropriate procedure for effecting peaceful changes or for the revision of treaties, and the League's lack of armed forces for carrying its decisions into effect.

It appears to us that almost all this criticism, although pointing to real deficiencies of the League of Nations, nevertheless misses the mark. It would be naive to expect that the various states, having become members of the League of Nations, would entirely renounce their imperialist policy whether in the sense of new plunder or in the sense of guarding that which they had acquired earlier. It would also be utopian to think that the representatives of distinct sovereign countries can in any international organization forget their national interests, completely overcome national egotism and act exclusively in the spirit of internationalism. It will be sufficient if the members of the international organization are filled with the consciousness that in combatting aggression, in barring its path in every way, and in participating in measures for assuring universal peace, they are acting in the interest not only of other countries but of their own. It would also be incorrect to think that by the use of peaceful revision of existing treaties it would have been possible to have averted Japan's attack on China and the aggression of Germany and Italy in relation to Abyssinia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Albania, etc.

In the careful study of the inactivity of the League in all the cases of aggression enumerated, one cannot but come to the conclusion that the conduct of the League was in no way predetermined by one or another of the concrete defects attributed to it or even by all of them taken together. There is no basis for any doubt that all the above-mentioned cases came within the competence of the League and that its statutes gave quite definite indications how it ought to have acted in such cases. It is true that the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

League of Nations did not have at its disposal international armed forces, but Article Sixteen of its Statutes gave the Council the right to indicate in appropriate cases what quantity of military, naval, or air forces each member of the League of Nations must assign for participations in "support of respect for the obligation of the League." However, we shall return to this essential problem.

* * *

The discussion of the principle of unanimity in the decision of questions in the Assembly deserves more serious consideration. It is well known that the League of Nations was unable to adopt resolutions regarding economic sanctions against Italy, which had attacked Abyssinia, because Switzerland, Austria, Hungary and Albania had objections. Representatives of these four states unequivocally made it understood that they would vote against any resolution on sanctions if it were put to a formal vote. Thanks to this conduct of four small states, the decision on sanctions had to be carried out by an individual poll of League members regarding their willingness to participate in sanctions. Such a solution of the problem naturally was obligatory only for states which gave an affirmative answer. Thus, it may be said that the decision on sanctions was not taken by the League at all but by the voluntary agreement of a group of states. Also well known are two cases in which resolutions of the assembly were disrupted because of lack of unanimity. In October, 1937, the resolution of the Spanish question failed as a result of the negative vote of Albania and Portugal. In the same month in the case of the Japanese-Chinese conflict, because of the absence of unanimity, it was necessary to substitute a recommendation for the resolution which had been worked out (according to the League's statutes, unanimity was not required for recommendations). In many other cases to achieve unanimity it was necessary to change or to soften resolutions, to give them an elastic character and to deprive them of any content. It is, therefore, impossible not to agree with the newspaper *Times* which, in an editorial written during November, 1943, stated that "The future League of Nations . . . cannot carry the doctrine of sovereign equality of states so far as to recognize the right of veto by individual members of the League."

This lesson of the League of Nations must be taken into account in establishing the new international organization replacing it, in which there must not be included the principle of unanimity for the decisions of general meetings. We would not go so far as others who propose that in the new organization the most important decisions, even regarding sanctions, be taken by a simple majority of votes. Such a majority is sufficient for questions of an organizational and procedural character. For more important decisions imposing serious obligations

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on all the members of the organization it would be possible to admit a qualified majority, say, of two-thirds.

It would be incorrect, however, to regard unanimity as the sole or the most important defect of the League of Nations. The real cause of its weakness was rooted in another circumstance, namely, in the mutual relations between the League of Nations and the great powers and in the relations of the great powers among themselves.

* * *

The fact is that over a period of fifteen years of its existence the League of Nations ignored the Soviet Union, one of the greatest world powers, and not only ignored it but displayed a definite hostility toward it. Let us remember, that at the time of the signing of the pact of the League of Nations, which set itself the task of averting war and aggression, the leading members and founders of the League were still continuing military intervention against the Soviet Republic. They were supporting civil war in it and were encouraging the campaign of the Polish army in the Ukraine.

Undoubtedly the majority of the members of the League sympathized with this policy, which fact could not but impart a definite character to all the future activity of the League from the very beginning. It is even possible, therefore, to say that the League of Nations was born in sin. Even after the Soviet Union entered the League of Nations, many of its proposals aiming at the strengthening of peace were rejected by the League of Nations, not so much because of their essence as because they proceeded from the Soviet state. This attitude of the great powers and the League itself toward the Soviet Union gave rise to and encouraged in certain countries a tendency toward aggression which counted on the impossibility of organizing an effective collective rebuff to aggression. It can now be considered established that Hitler's aggressiveness to a considerable degree was also nourished by the estrangement which had been created between the U.S.S.R. on one side, and the other great powers and the League of Nations on the other.

Refusal to collaborate with the Soviet Union exerted still greater negative influence on the potential possibilities of the League of Nations because another great power, the United States of America, remained out of the League from the very beginning. To all this must be added the fact that the great powers remaining in the capacity of leaders of the League of Nations, Great Britain and France, did not at all succeed in establishing harmony between themselves in their leadership of the League. They did not have the same attitude toward all cases of aggression. Each of them was prepared, and that only platonically, to condemn such aggression as might directly injure its own interests and the interests of states associated with it, but they did not react to other cases of aggression. There can be no doubt that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these two powers played the dominating role in the League of Nations and in the majority of cases could have controlled it. But they did not feel the special responsibility resting upon them. It would be better to say that they were easily able to shed this responsibility, relying on the formal equality in the League of all its members, which created the appearance and the impression of responsibility identical for each; all the more so since even in the council of the League the great powers were in the minority. Let us recall, by the way, that instead of the original proposal for a council of five representatives of the great powers and four from other states, in 1941 of thirteen members of the council, only two represented great powers.

It is necessary further to note the undoubted fact that even those states which are prepared to fulfill scrupulously any obligations assumed by them by force of treaties signed with one, two or several other states, do not acknowledge the same significance and force in the case of other obligations arising out of their signature of such general international agreements, as, for example, the pact of the League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact, etc. One does not have to go far to find an example. Great Britain and France, in the capacity of members of the League, assumed the obligation under the League pact of coming to the aid of any victim of aggression, applying to the aggressor at least a complete boycott. They, however, easily forgot this obligation in connection with the attacks of Japan on China, of Italy on Abyssinia, of Hitlerite Germany on Austria and Czechoslovakia. But when they had concluded a special guarantee agreement with Poland, even the Heroes of Munich, Neville Chamberlain and Daladier, did not refuse to fulfill their obligations in respect to Poland, and they declared war on Germany under conditions less favorable for them than in the other above-listed cases. To be sure, other factors also played a part here, in particular the cumulative effect of Hitlerite aggressive actions, but there can be no doubt that fear of loss of international prestige in the event of non-fulfillment of the obligations assumed by them under the treaty with Poland played its role in this case.

Is it necessary to demonstrate the impossibility of assuring general security without the guiding, the most active role of the great powers? It is quite apparent that in all cases in which the League exhibited its inactivity and experienced failure, only the great powers, singly, in groups, or together could have halted aggression. It must not be forgotten also that decisions regarding effective repelling of aggression must be adopted and executed in the briefest possible time, remembering the fact that in the modern age wars are begun by aggressors without preliminary warning and that preparation for them proceeds under cover of the deepest secrecy. Let us suppose that the League of Nations had wanted to answer Hitler's attack

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against Poland in 1939 by some sort of action. Under the slowness of procedure, characteristic of the League of Nations and of any organization with many members, Hitler would have succeeded in smashing Poland, Belgium, Holland and other small states and in correspondingly increasing his strength, before the League Council and after it the Assembly could have taken, let alone have carried out, any decision. Again, it is only the great powers who are able to act effectively against a big aggressor, the great powers which have the necessary military and industrial resources, and they cannot be replaced by any union of small states, which would be shattered by the aggressor one by one. This smashing of each of the small states and the appropriation of their resources moreover strengthens the position of the aggressor in relation to the great powers.

These truths are understood and accepted now by many and therefore the majority of persons now speaking and writing in regard to a future mechanism of security turn away from the principle of false equality which was the basis of the old League. At the same time, the thought that in a future organ of security the genuinely guiding and decisive role must be assumed by the great powers, which have demonstrated in fact during the present war their greatness, stability and power, gains increasing recognition.

This thought has found expression in the recent statements of many statesmen. For example, Mr. Eden has said: "The responsibility for the preservation of peace must fall in the first instance on the Four Powers who signed the Moscow Declaration. Those who bear the greatest responsibility, those on whose shoulders the burden will fall, must have the greater voice in deciding on any action to be taken in the general interest." *

Another member of the British cabinet, Mr. Herbert Morrison, also expressed the same thought, stating:

"Among the United Nations special responsibility rests with the great powers, particularly with Russia, the United States, England and China, as the possessors of armed forces destined to play the decisive role in the world. The sword of world justice and of the highest world authority will be in the hands of these four nations."

Another outstanding representative of the English government and a former important leader of the League of Nations, Sir Arthur Salter, states:

"All states, whether they are great or small, must be equal, in their right to justice, but it does not follow from this that they must possess the same influence or have the same right to a voice in the determination of international policy."

There are also parallel statements on the part of American political leaders. For example, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States, Mr. Berle, says:

* From a speech delivered on February 3, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"On the four great states in the last analysis will rest the reorganized general peace."

The Republican Senator Austin states the same thing:

"The Soviet Union, China, England and the United States must take upon themselves leadership in the postwar council of nations, in order to make certain a lasting peace."

The head of the government of the Union of South Africa, General Smuts, put the matter still more forcefully in stating:

"We must be concerned that in the new international organization leadership remains in the hands of this great trio of powers. These three great powers will have to preserve for themselves leadership during the war, in time of peace, and take responsibility for maintaining security and assuring peace in the whole world. The United States, the British Commonwealth of Nations and the U.S.S.R. are destined for this leadership and for assuming responsibility for defense. To these powers may be added China, as a mark of recognition of the significance belonging to it by virtue of its heroic resistance to Japan and its leading role in Asia."

It would be possible to quote a multitude of similar expressions. In this sense the "declaration regarding general security" elaborated at the Moscow Conference in October 1943, and expressing the readiness of the great democratic powers to take practical measures with a view to establishing an international organization for the maintenance of international peace and security also has special significance.

From the above the conclusion follows automatically that the future international security organization, if it genuinely desires to be effective and to avoid the failure of the League of Nations, must be based upon the firm active leadership of the great powers which have demonstrated their might in the present war. These powers which will form the directive organ of the new organization, must assume responsibility for organizing resistance to any aggression, if necessary by their own forces alone irrespective of the position of the remaining members of the organization. The responsibility for guarding peace must not be divided among sixty or more states, must not be entrusted to an impersonal organization, but must rest upon those few big states which have the actual force necessary for this purpose. Taking into consideration what has been said above regarding the insufficient strength of obligations arising from pacts of a declarative character, we would consider it very important that the great powers take upon themselves appropriate obligations regarding active participation in the struggle with aggression; not only on the basis of such declarative pacts, but also on the basis of treaties concluded with one another. In these treaties there must be defined as precisely as possible the role of each power in extinguishing this or that center of aggression. This role, of course, will not be the same for each power in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each case, and will depend on a number of political, geographic and strategic conditions, but at the same time their mutual aid to one another in any action for safeguarding peace must be assumed in one degree or another.

At the head of the future organization there will thus stand a union of great powers, and not scattered states acting individually, and selected by turns. Because of the tremendous responsibility which, by virtue of this, falls to each great power, the decisions of the directive organ on important questions cannot be taken otherwise than unanimously.

The very fact of the existence of such a closely bound directive organ, consisting of the mightiest states of the world, each linked with the other, not only by membership in a general international organization, but by special individual treaties, an organ not numerous in its membership and therefore capable of speedy and energetic action, cannot but act as a warning to potential aggressors. The latter will not longer be able to build their aggressive calculations on the playing off of some great powers against others, and even the most self-assured maniacs of the type of Hitler will be forced to think ten times before venturing upon a decisive clash with such a bloc.

In the organization of security on the basis indicated above it will not be necessary to think about that complicated problem of an international police force, which occupies the minds of the founders of the League of Nations and of those who continue to conceive of the new organization of security solely according to the pattern of the League of Nations with its equality of responsibility and consequent impersonality of responsibility. Once the responsibility devolves upon the organization, and not upon states, then inevitably it becomes necessary to rack one's brains over the task of endowing the organization with, as it is customary to put it, a real force. Then it is necessary to create some sort of international army, existing parallel with the international organization, which could control it. Or perhaps should it be proposed to the members that they allot out of their national armies special military units which, remaining in their own country, would be at the disposal of the international organization? Or should not the organization be allowed to recruit soldiers in various states for the international army?

Such utopian plans were discussed in connection with the founding of the League of Nations, during the period of its existence, and still continue to be discussed in the press. These plans are utopian because, as the present war has shown, in order to oppose big aggressors hundreds of divisions of all types of arms with corresponding technical equipment are required. It is perfectly clear that such armies cannot be gathered in any one neutral country, the site of the international organization, geogpraphically removed from the bases of supply of the army. There is also no sense in the idea

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that states in the composition of national armies should designate special units for international military activity. If any state should refuse to participate in international action, it would, of course, prohibit participation therein of its own units, however they might have been designated; if on the other hand it were prepared to take action against aggression, then rather than designate in advance military units, it would be necessary to define the number of troops which it must furnish. Such questions become idle in the system of special agreements among the great powers envisaged by us, in which there will be defined the quantity of forces of each state, questions of supply, command and so on, in international measures against aggressors.

In speaking of the dominating role of the great powers in mastering aggression we certainly do not wish to state that the role of the small nations in the cause of safeguarding peace and security will be nullified. In many, even if not in all cases, in fulfilling their obligations the great powers will require this or that degree of aid from a small nation, in the utilization of naval and air bases on their territory, in the passage of troops and even in the active participation of their national forces in military operations. Cases are conceivable in which the extinguishing of small centers of aggression may be entrusted to a group of small nations either with or without the assistance of one or several great powers. Finally, the safeguarding of peace and security presupposes, not only armed struggle with aggressors, which is the extreme measure, but also methods of forestalling aggression by means of applying various kinds of sanctions.

In some cases in order to sober an aggressor state it will be sufficient to break off diplomatic or commercial and financial relations, and also to cut off railway, telegraphic and aerial communications. In other more serious cases recourse will be required to blockade, and in third cases even to naval and aerial demonstrations.

After the unsuccessful experience in the application of economic sanctions against Italy in the Abyssinian conflict, many persons began to express doubts regarding the effectiveness of this instrument. Even the Acting Secretary of the League of Nations in his report for last year emphasizes that experience has apparently demonstrated the infeasibility of economic sanctions applied without other measures. To us these doubts seem unjustified and references to the experience with Italy unfounded. It must be remembered that only economic sanctions of a limited character were applied against Italy. These sanctions did not extend to such a vitally important article of import for that state as oil. Moreover, not only states not belonging to the League, like Germany and Japan, failed to participate in the sanctions, but even certain members of the League mentioned above. Furthermore, thanks to the complicated and slow procedure of the League, the application

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of economic sanctions was somewhat delayed. We are inclined to think, therefore, that the full application by all members of the future international organization of all the means of economic pressure at their disposal, can in many cases produce a desirable result and it is scarcely proper to dismiss these measures. They can render no small service also as a supplementary instrument in the application of armed measures against the aggressors, who will thus be subjected to a general boycott.

In objecting to projects for establishing a large independent army connected with the future international organization as unrealizable, we admit, however, and would consider desirable the establishment under this organization of an international military air corps for admonitory and punitive purposes. The appearance of several hundred military air craft over the capital of a state which was preparing aggression could not but produce an appropriate impression. And if such a demonstration proved to be without result this could lead to the bombardment of definite military objectives of the aggressive state.

As we see in the application of the above-mentioned sanctions, a significant role will be allotted to the small nations which, of course, will also participate in the making of decisions connected with such sanctions. Through the general meeting of members of the organization, almost all questions connected with its activities will as a rule pass. The decisions of the meeting will, however, require preliminary approval or subsequent confirmation by the directive organ. Only in exceptional cases, for example, in the consideration of military measures carried out by the forces of the great powers alone, must the directive organ be empowered to take independent decisions, to be subsequently reported to the general meeting. The increased responsibility of the great powers in safeguarding peace must naturally be accompanied by some expansion of their rights in their capacity as members of the directive organ. In this connection it may be recalled that in the last years before the present war, in the League of Nations itself, the spokesmen for Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland and other states demanded a lessening of the obligations of small nations in comparison with the great powers. Characteristic in this respect is the recent radio statement of the President of the Norwegian parliament, Mr. Hambro, who has always been regarded as a spokesman for the small nations. Mr. Hambro stated as follows:

"Each small nation must renounce the favorite idea that its influence in world affairs must be just as great as the influence of any other nation and reconcile itself to the fact that the principle of unanimity cannot be applied to the regulation of international life; that in the future each tiny state cannot be allowed to impose an absolute veto or enjoy the right to dictate to the great powers, even if only in a negative fashion, how they must act.

"In any universal organization whatever it may be called, several

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great powers will have to bear the burden of carrying into effect the final decisions of the world organ of authority, and these countries must be granted, in constitutional order, a formal authority, corresponding to their real and actual responsibility."

The plan outlined by us thus meets such desires.

We would consider as one of the deficiencies of the League of Nations the fact that it was overloaded with functions having no relationship to its direct task, the safeguarding of security and peace. To carry out these functions the League has dozens of divisions, technical commissions, committees, sub-committees, bureaus, etc. The political work of the League foundered in the multiplicity of activity of these technical organizations, a fact which distorted the true picture of the general activity of the League and gave rise to a false conception of its role. Despite its complete political sterility, the League of Nations always proudly held up its head in the consciousness of effecting some sort of tremendous work. Work of this type even now helps it to create an impression of existence, despite its obvious political death.

We propose that the future international organization of security must concentrate all its energy and attention on the consideration and deciding of only such problems as have a direct relationship to the peaceful resolution of international conflicts and the safeguarding of general peace and security. It will be much easier to observe the success or failure of an organization for security if it is not weighed down with an endless number of superfluous functions. We emphatically do not deny the usefulness and desirability of there being various kinds of international organizations of humanitarian and other character, but for these there can be established some sort of general international organ or separate organizations for each field. This applies also to the International Labor Office. The work of this organization was never synchronized with the activity of the League of Nations. Indeed, the relationship between them existed only artificially. We do not believe there is any need of uniting the future labor organization with the security organization.

With regard to the procedure itself, of establishing the international organization of security, it would seem to us that the draft constitution must be worked out by conversations among the four great powers and then go for decision to a conference of all the United Nations, which should become the founders and original members of the organization. When this is completed, it will be possible to propose to neutral states that they join the organization. After a definite trial period has expired, the doors of the organization must be opened also to Germany and its satellites. However, any state can be expelled which propagandizes and practices racial, religious and national discrimination, adheres to the theory of the domination of one nation or race over others, or to other similar the-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ories of a fascist character. Such states may neither enter the international organization nor remain members of it.

By no means do we set ourselves the task of exhausting in this article all those many problems confronting us in the establishment of an international security organization. It is sufficient, in our opinion, to sketch for the moment the fundamentals of the future organization. So far as we know, ready plans for such an organization do not as yet exist. We will be pleased if our present article furnishes a stimulus to further discussion of this theme and to the possible presentation of other fundamental principles distinct from ours. Of one thing we are convinced —that without *firm leadership of a union of great powers,* an international organization of security cannot exist which would not be threatened by the unenviable fate of the League of Nations.

(From *Zvezda* (Star), Leningrad weekly.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEWEY AND TEHERAN

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

THE United States is now far and away the most powerful capitalist country in the world. Mr. Dewey, if elected President, would try to transform this situation into American imperialist domination over the entire world. A Dewey Administration would not, of course, suddenly discard the Teheran agreement and embark upon a policy of individual action, as W. W. Aldrich, head of the Chase National Bank, is advocating. Rather its course would be to try to make Great Britain into a sort of junior partner, and then, by a system of economic and political pressures, controls, and maneuvers, gradually to concentrate decisive world hegemony in Washington.

The central issue in this vital election, therefore, is whether, under a Roosevelt Administration and in the spirit of the Teheran agreement, the United States shall cooperate loyally with Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., China and the rest of the United Nations to win the war, to smash fascism, to set up an effective post-war world organization for maintaining peace, and to begin a systematic economic reconstruction of the world, or whether, under a Dewey Administration, our country shall begin a will-o'-the-wisp imperialist adventure for American world supremacy that could lead only to national and international disaster. Earl Browder long ago correctly stated that the main issue of the election is for or against Teheran.

Behind Roosevelt stands the body of American democracy, the heart of such national unity as we have, including almost the entire labor movement, major masses of the city middle classes, large sections of the farmers, the bulk of the Negro people, and also the more far-sighted elements among the capitalists. Around Dewey are assembled the reactionary forces of America, made up, among others, of a strong percentage of the farmers, and a very heavy section of the capitalists, dominated by the most fascist-minded elements: the Hearsts, McCormicks, Pews, Duponts, Girdlers, etc. Supporting Dewey, too, is about 80 per cent of the nation's press. The Dewey forces are also in Con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressional working agreement with the reactionary Southern Democratic poll-taxers.

Obviously there is a split in the ranks of the capitalists regarding Teheran. Mr. Roosevelt has behind him many important capitalist forces, who see the wisdom of a policy of world collaboration with other nations on a give-and-take basis, fearing that otherwise not only the nation's interests, but also their own class interests, will be sacrificed; but the bulk of the big capitalists are lined up in the camp of Mr. Dewey and are going along with his policy of militant American imperialism. Last May, *Fortune* magazine, in a "management poll," gave Dewey 56.9 per cent, Willkie 29.0 per cent, Roosevelt 8.2 per cent, and MacArthur 5.9 per cent of capitalist support. With the elimination of Willkie and MacArthur as candidates, however, undoubtedly the bulk of their capitalist support passed over to Dewey. Almost all the great employers' organizations are dominated by pro-Dewey sentiment.

It is their urge for a policy of active imperialist expansion that explains why the reactionary backers of Dewey are so fiercely determined to prevent the reelection of Roosevelt, despite the fact that he, supported by the more liberal and intelligent sections of the employers, has done more than any other man in the United States to make the mortally sick capitalist system work. It was Roosevelt who, during the great economic crisis of the 'thirties, revived prostrate capitalism through a series of laws which today even his most rabid opponents at least formally endorse. Under Roosevelt, too, the capitalists have reaped big profits and the monopolies have expanded. Roosevelt also is leading our country to victory against enemies who menaced our national existence and the whole position of American capitalism. And it was Roosevelt who at Teheran helped work out a policy of victory, peace and reconstruction that offers a practical perspective to the capitalist system both here and abroad.

Yet the bulk of big American capitalists and their press hate Roosevelt as the devil hates holy water. This is partly because of Roosevelt's long-demonstrated concern for the welfare of the masses, and especially because his policies have helped the trade unions grow from two million to thirteen million members; but the main reason is their deep conviction that Roosevelt, with his liberal policies at home and democratic collaboration on a world scale, is a stumbling block to their program of unrestricted monopoly control in this country and predatory imperialist expansion abroad.

Of course, not all of Dewey's followers are active imperialists; certainly not the great mass of his farmer supporters, nor, by far, all of the employers that are backing him. But the decisive leaders and backers of the Republican Party are for militant imperialism, and beyond question a Dewey Administration would pursue such a policy. And

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these people know quite well how to hook the isolationist and semi-isolationist sentiment in this country behind their car of imperialism.

The aggressively imperialist section of the reactionaries behind Dewey, whom Henry Wallace correctly called "international freebooters," are convinced that now is the appointed time to begin to realize Henry Luce's so-called "American Century." These people, blandly ignoring insuperable obstacles in the path of their imperialist program (these we shall deal with later), see that the rival capitalist states of Germany, Japan, France and Italy have been practically ruined by the war, that Great Britain has been seriously weakened, and that the socialist U.S.S.R., heavily war-devastated, will be concentrating mainly upon its gigantic internal reconstruction program in the post-war period; whereas, in sharp contrast, the United States has not been damaged by the war, but actually strengthened. They know, too, that the United States has much the largest navy and airforce in the world, as well as one of the most powerful armies, and that, consequently, it can talk very big if it so desires. They realize also that this country, with incomparably the largest and most efficient industrial system and biggest merchant fleet in existence, can out-compete any nation in the post-war world markets. And, finally, they are quite aware that stored away in Fort Knox are 23 billion dollars in gold, about seven-eighths of the world's reserves, which could constitute a potentially extremely powerful imperialist weapon in a world full of bankrupt nations.

All these facts, in the wishful thinking of the power-hungry imperialists, for whom the Deweys, Hoovers, Tafts, Vandenbergs, McCormicks, etc., are political spokesmen, amount to a perfect set-up in which to establish American world domination, and they are determined to accomplish just that. This eager imperialism explains their cynical attitude towards Teheran and their pursuing general military, economic and political policies which would undoubtedly bring the United States into collision with the general program laid down at Teheran.

Of course, the Dewey reactionaries are very careful to cover up, as best they can, their imperialist program. They know full well that the overwhelming masses of the American people are democratically minded, want to work loyally with the U.S.S.R. and other countries, and are opposed to imperialism. They realize, therefore, that any hint on their part that they are for imperialist expansion would be fatal for Dewey's election chances. Hence, with the most brazen demagogy in American political history, the Dewey forces are playing down their real aggressively imperialist character and are trying to make it appear that they are in essential agreement with Roosevelt's basic policies of national unity at home and collaboration abroad. Once in power, however, these people would

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

promptly abandon all these election-time shibboleths, designed to capture the votes of the unwary, and begin their true program of increased monopoly domination at home and vigorous imperialist expansion abroad.

There are, however, some individuals who are so fascinated by the prize of imperialist world domination that they are speaking out frankly, even if Dewey is not. Thus, Walter Lippmann, in his book, *U.S. War Aims,* comes forward with a scheme of post-war world organization containing a plan to set up a great "Atlantic Community." This community would consist of the United States, Great Britain, the countries of North and South America, Australia, and practically all of Europe, including Germany, right up "to the borders of the Soviet Union." In the proposal for this tremendous political agglomeration, three points are clear: (a) containing at least four-fifths of the world's industry, it would be the world's strongest economic, political and military force; (b) the United States, by virtue of her great strength, would be able to dominate it; and (c) its spearpoint would be directed against the U.S.S.R. In short, whatever the intentions of Mr. Lippmann, the whole proposition is a brazen bid for American world imperialist mastery in the spirit of Dewey, Hoover, Taft, Vandenberg, McCormick, et al.

The election of Dewey would provoke a national and international disaster. An attempt to apply his aggressively imperialist policies would lead to an economic smash-up at home and abroad; it would intensify the class struggle here and would cause civil war in Europe; it would strengthen reaction and fascism in the United States and internationally, and it would sow dragon's teeth for a World War III.

The Dewey menace presents itself in a two-fold guise: First, there is the danger of Dewey actually being elected, when he would plunge our country into his contemplated, ill-omened program of imperialist expansion. Secondly, there is the additional danger that even if Dewey should lose the election, as he probably will, the reactionary forces he represents may nevertheless remain strong enough in Congress and elsewhere to hamstring a Roosevelt Administration and thereby prevent it from taking the decisive and far-reaching progressive measures that will be indispensable if our country and the world are to overcome the devastation of this war and start out vigorously upon the tasks foreseen at Teheran. Such sabotage, by paralyzing the American Government, would, if not checked, be a direct route to world chaos.

Dewey's Imperialism Would Provoke a New War

The Dewey imperialists are grossly deceiving themselves in thinking that the world, despite all its present war-devastation, would submit to the American imperialist domination which they believe they can

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establish, almost for the asking. These reactionaries, looking backward to the heyday of imperialism following World War I, fail to take into consideration the profound anti-imperialist spirit that the present war has loosed among the peoples of the world. To an unparalleled degree the masses have become determined to place serious curbs upon the imperialism which exists in every capitalist power in greater or larger degree, and which has cursed the world with unheard of calamities during the past generation—two world wars, a devastating crisis, and the growth of world fascism.

World War I was an imperialist war. The governments of all the great powers involved were dominated by imperialist groups of bankers, industrialists and landowners, and the war was a struggle between the German-Austrian and the British-French-American-Russian-Japanese blocs for world control. Germany was beaten in her attempt to oust the older and more powerful imperialist states from world domination. The period following the war was an armistice rather than a genuine peace; for the imperialist powers kept maneuvering for position. British and French imperialism dominated Europe and most of the Far East through the League of Nations, while American imperialism kept out and played its own game, strengthening its grip upon Latin America and in the Far East, and also becoming the chief creditor nation of the world. Meanwhile German imperialism, now turned fascist, had largely recovered from its defeat in World War I, with the help of British, French, and American tories, who wanted to use it in a drive to destroy the socialist Soviet Union. But German imperialism did not relish being used as such a cat's paw. Instead, it had plans of world domination of its own, which it started to realize by its "anti-komintern" alliance with Japan and Italy and by a joint program of aggression against a whole row of smaller and weaker countries—Spain, Ethiopia, China, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc.

World War II also began in September, 1939, as an imperialist war. The British, French and American reactionaries had hoped that it would be an all-out capitalist war against the U.S.S.R., but their plans went askew. They envisaged the setting up of a reactionary or even a fascist world in which their respective powers would play the decisive role. But the German and Japanese imperialists thought otherwise. Their own plans contemplated the subjugation of Great Britain, France and the United States, as well as the rest of the world, to their control. Such a positional inferiority, of course, the powerful capitalist rulers in the latter countries could not accept. So, when Hitler, pursuing his path of world conquest, attacked Poland, Great Britain and France declared war upon Germany. For many months, however, the Munichites of the western powers maneuvered to direct the blow of the war against the U.S.S.R.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

World War II did not long remain an imperialist war, but soon became a war of national liberation. From the outset of the war there had been in it some elements of a national war, among them the gallant fights of the Chinese, Greeks, and Yugoslavs to save themselves from fascist slavery. The national aspects of the war were further strengthened when Great Britain and France, with their armies shattered by Hitler's victorious drive across Europe, stood face to face with national extinction and were compelled to fight for their very existence. The war, however, took on its decisive character as a war of national liberation when Hitler, callously violating his non-aggression treaty, invaded the U.S.S.R in June, 1941, in a barbarous attempt to devastate that great nation. Japan's attack upon the United States six months later, followed at once by Germany's declaration of war against us, events which put our nation's very life in jeopardy, brought our country as a leading power into the global war of national liberation.

The changed nature of the war resulted in the formation of the United Nations, the adoption of democratic war aims, the eventual working out of a coalition military strategy, and the strengthening of the democratic forces in all countries. It also released a great surge of anti-imperialist spirit throughout the world. This deeply affected the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and the occupied countries of Europe. Also among the masses of the people in the great capitalist powers of Great Britain and the United States, including important sections of the capitalists themselves, the determination grew rapidly to put an end to, or at least to limit, aggressive capitalist imperialism, by establishing cooperative world relationships in place of the characteristic brutal struggle for markets, raw material sources, and strategic position, that has deluged the world with blood twice within one generation and will surely soon do so again if it is not checked.

It is in the face of this great world, anti-imperialist trend of the peoples that the Dewey imperialists are coming forward with their plans for American world domination. But to their greedy hopes, history will reply with an emphatic "No!" The world peoples are sick to death of attempts of great capitalist powers to dominate the world, whether they do it in the ultra-brutal manner of Germany and Japan, or by the systems of economic and diplomatic pressures that a Dewey would employ. They are moving in the direction of world collaboration of the nations, instead of world struggle among them. The peoples of India and China will never accept some new, Dewey-contrived form of national slavery; likewise the nations of Latin America will not submit to the renaissance of Hooveristic domination that the Dewey forces are planning, and the Soviet Union, of course, will never tolerate the new edition of the *cordon sanitaire* that Dewey is cooking up with his

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anglo-American alliance directed against the U.S.S.R. The lesser peoples of the capitalist world, and the masses in the great capitalist states also will not permit themselves to be used as the pawns and serfs of imperialist-minded American monopolists. In view of all this, therefore, for Dewey, if elected, to try to put into effect his program of American world domination would lead to world economic chaos and in the direction of war.

Sabotage of the World Peace Organization

It is in full accord with Dewey's program of American world domination that he is trying to prevent the formation of a strong post-war organization of the peoples, able and willing to maintain world peace, such as the Roosevelt Administration contemplates. What Dewey wants is a free hand for American imperialism to play power politics. Inasmuch, however, as the American people, including vital sections of the capitalists, are almost solidly in support of an effective post-war peace organization, he and his isolationist supporters would not dare to propose a policy of absentism from such a body.

As this is being written, the Dumbarton Oaks Conference has just submitted its proposals for the post-war peace organization. Mr. Dewey has endorsed the report as "excellent progress." But his endorsement must be taken with great reserve as, also, for example, his new-found solicitude for the trade unions, for the extension of social insurance, for the strengthening of our ties with the U.S.S.R., etc. Dewey is compelled to say these things if he hopes to be elected. To take any other stand would be suicidal in the elections. But, as for policy, when once in power, that would be quite another story. J. Hamilton Fish, notorious isolationist-imperialist supporter of Dewey, also endorses the Dumbarton Oaks report, and in almost identical terms with Dewey's. But Fish, more obviously than Dewey, is already seeking openly to block the report by insisting upon an indefinite period of discussion, by demagogically demanding that the adoption of the report proposals by the Senate be made contingent upon whether or not there is a just peace, etc.

The imperialist forces are aiming to have established some such ramshackle organization as the old League of Nations, one which would be too weak and reactionary to interfere effectively with the program of militant American imperialism. In this respect we can learn valuable lessons from the past.

After World War I the victorious powers set up the League of Nations, with the general program of maintaining world peace. But the League was quite incapable of accomplishing this huge task. From the outset, the great capitalist powers used or misused it as their imperialist interests dictated. Great Britain and France utilized it to dominate Europe, the United States stayed out of it altogether in order

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to have a free hand, and Germany, Japan and Italy flouted it as they saw fit. The League's action could be paralyzed by the dissenting vote of even one small state; it had no power at its disposal to enforce peace, and it was without any economic program whatsoever. Hence, the League made no effective opposition, even under the insistent urging of the U.S.S.R., which joined the League in 1934, against the invasion of China, Spain, Ethiopia, etc., by the fascist powers in their developing drive to conquer the whole earth. Nor did the League take any steps to alleviate the great economic crisis of the 'thirties. Under the pressure of the great events of the war decade, therefore, it just folded up and died, a victim of its own internal weaknesses.

It is some such anemic world peace organization as the old League that the Dewey imperialists, in their brand new garb as international collaborationists, actually would like to create. But a very different type of organization indeed is coming out of this war of national liberation. The peoples of the world have built up during the course of this war against fascism a great military alliance, the United Nations. With victory, they intend to have this transformed into a powerful democratic organization of states which, by curbing the inherent imperialism of the capitalist great powers, would firmly maintain peace and bring about an economic reconstruction of the world. The main responsibility to make this world organization work will rest upon the shoulders of the Big Four powers that are winning the war. And it has the backing to an extent never known by the old League, of the masses of the people of the world, including powerful sections of capitalists everywhere, who are convinced that another world war would be fatal to the capitalist system.

This new world coalition of democratic, anti-fascist forces, the United Nations, has gradually developed its program, as well as its organization, during the war—in the Atlantic Charter, the Four Freedoms, and the decisions of the various military, economic and political conferences of Casablanca, Quebec, Cairo, Moscow, and, above all, Teheran. Its basic program of victory in the war, the establishment of a post-war peace organization, the extermination of fascism and the strengthening of democracy, and the development of an orderly post-war economic cooperation among the peoples of the world, is steadily going into effect through successful coalition warfare, through the movement to improve the world's food supply and distribution (Hot Springs Conference), through the organization of relief for devastated peoples (U.N.R.R.A.), through the improvement of world monetary conditions (Bretton Woods financial conference), and through the Dumbarton Oaks conference, which has made real progress toward solving the great problem of the world peace organization. Never in its ill-fated history did the League of Nations,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

child of the imperialist World War I, display such unity of action, have so concrete a program, or exhibit a comparable democratic spirit.

The Dewey - Hoover - Vandenberg aggressively imperialist forces have watched with wry faces this whole development. As pointed out earlier, their attitude towards every phase of world collaboration of the United Nations—military, economic, and political—has been one of ill-disguised opposition. They have continuously sniped at it, when they did not dare to oppose it openly. Especially now they are interested in preventing the establishment of a strong and responsible post-war world cooperation between the United States, Great Britain, the U.S.S.R., China and eventually France, as the real force behind the whole United Nations. Above all, they are enemies of real cooperation between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. They want the Soviet Union's vast trade, but they do not want to treat that country as a political equal. Close international collaboration would cramp the maneuverability of American imperialism. According to them the ideal world organization would be one along the lines of the old League of Nations in which even one state could bring the whole thing to a standstill. This explains Dewey's demagogic warning against four-power domination of the United Nations and his hypocritical championship of the rights of the small nations, on the eve of the vital Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Dewey's statement was an attack upon the very heart of effective post-war collaboration and it threw a bright light upon his whole imperialist program.

The sabotage of world cooperation by the Dewey imperialists all through the war, their attacks upon the coalition military strategy, their sniping at Lend-Lease, etc., is a clear indication of what their post-war policy would be, were they to get control of the American Government in the November elections. They would try to cripple international collaboration in every direction, in the ultra-selfish interests of an American imperialism striving for economic and political domination over all other nations.

The Dewey Imperialist Economic Program

The economic program of the Dewey forces, international and domestic, is fully in harmony with their general political objective of American imperialist world domination. In the hands of a Dewey Administration, this policy would tend definitely to defeat the perspective of orderly economic and democratic political development laid down at the Teheran Conference, and which Earl Browder has dealt with so extensively in his book, *Teheran, Our Path in War and Peace.*

In the international field, if the catastrophic effects of this war are to be overcome and if future and still more ruinous economic crises are to be prevented or alleviated, many new and far-reaching measures will have to be adopted. Among

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these are joint action of the various powers for the systematic building up of foreign trade, including the planful industrialization of backward and devastated countries through long-term, low-interest loans, the lowering of tariff barriers among the various countries, the curtailing of the monopolistic practices of international cartels, and the progressive raising of the living standards and purchasing power of the toiling masses throughout the world. It is in this general direction that the Roosevelt Administration and the United Nations are gradually heading.

In the domestic field in the various countries, no less drastic economic measures will have to be applied. There must be economic planning by the governments, including ours, on an unprecedented scale; the working and living conditions of the masses have to be radically improved, and the monopolistic power of the trusts must be curbed. On the latter point, many of the European nations are now proposing extensive nationalization of their basic, trustified industries. For these peoples are coming to understand the elementary fact that it is the powerful, fascist-minded sections of monopoly capital that are the main obstacle to social progress. These elements were primarily responsible for the two world wars; their restrictive practices greatly worsened the recent world economic depression; it was in their reactionary ranks that fascism originated and still flourishes; and if their forces are not definitely curbed by the peoples, they will cause humanity fresh disasters, even more catastrophic than those they have already brought upon the world.

The Dewey imperialistic economic program goes directly counter to all these needful measures, both internationally and nationally. In the international sphere Dewey's trade policy would be a dog-eat-dog grab for world markets, in the expectation of the United States triumphing on the basis of its superior industrial equipment and resources. The Dewey imperialists sneer at all proposals to industrialize backward countries and to raise international mass living standards, as a "world W.P.A.," "globaloney" and as Uncle Sam acting as milk dispenser to deserving Hottentots. They are defenders of the monopolistic international cartels; they cling to their traditional high tariff policies, and they oppose efforts (as at Bretton Woods) to limit by governmental control the dictatorial actions of imperialistic world bankers.

In the American domestic sphere, the Deweyites' economic program would run no less in opposition to the urgent needs of the situation. Their demagogic outcry about "free enterprise," their attacks upon every semblance of government planning, their belittlement of full production and full employment as both undesirable and impossible, their resistance to raising the workers' real wages, their fight against even the moderate social insurance proposals of the Kilgore Bill, their sabotage of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all wartime economic controls, their constant attacks upon the labor movement, and their obvious reliance upon the illusion of an old-style, essentially spontaneous post-war industrial boom to take care of every economic problem—all constitute proposals to return, under far more dangerous conditions, to the unbridled, monopoly-dominated economic anarchy of the Hoover period, which led to the great economic crisis of 1929. The present Presidential election fight by the Deweyites is an attempt to break down the curbs that the American people have erected against voracious monopolists. Especially they want to remove the democratic Roosevelt Administration and to weaken the trade union movement, as necessary domestic conditions for their projected struggle for world imperialist domination.

The Spearhead of Post-War World Reaction

The forces behind Dewey constitute not only the cohorts of aggressive American imperialism; but also, in a larger sense, they represent an attempt to organize world reaction for an offensive, especially in the post-war period, against everything democratic and progressive. After World War I, the big capitalists, bankers and landowners of the world, fearful of the great democratic upsurge of the people then taking place, which knocked three emperors from their thrones and established Socialism in Russia, organized a reactionary movement to beat down the awakening democratic peoples. This reactionary big-capitalist offensive, with the aid of Social-Democracy, not only checked the spread of Socialism beyond the U.S.S.R., but it eventually resulted in the birth of fascism, the drive of German and Japanese imperialism for world control, and the development of the perspective of a fascist, or ultra-reactionary world in the minds of the big capitalists far and wide in all countries. This great post-World War I reactionary offensive was finally climaxed in the outbreak of World War II.

The inevitable trend of the Dewey militant imperialists is in this same general direction. Should Dewey be elected President, it would be not only a major defeat for democracy in this country, but everywhere else as well. The peoples of Latin America and the Far East would be appalled by it; so would the great Soviet nation, and likewise the struggling democratic forces throughout Europe and the rest of the world. It would be a staggering blow to international democracy.

Conversely, a Dewey success would be hailed throughout the world by the reactionary and fascist elements as their victory, and rightly so. If Dewey should capture the Presidency, it would not only greatly strengthen the Red-baiters, anti-Semites, union-busters, native fascists and world-dominators in our country; it would also give new hope and strength to hard-pressed fascism all

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the world. For a Dewey administration, in its bid for world supremacy, would cultivate and use these sinister elements for its own purposes. They would be its natural allies against the resurgent democratic world forces which are now manifesting themselves in the prosecution of the war, and which will play a decisive role in the shaping up of the peace. British tories of the Cliveden stripe, who have had to "play dead" during the war, would be stirred to renewed activity; German industrialists, bankers and landowners, the main pillars of Nazism, would appeal, and not in vain, for a "soft peace," one that would leave them in control of Germany; quisling capitalists and war criminals all over liberated Europe would get help from a Dewey government in their efforts to stem the tide of democracy and peoples' justice that is now threatening to engulf them; the new democratic governments developing in the freed countries would have to face hostile pressures from a Dewey administration; our great Soviet ally would find in Dewey, not an honest collaborator, but a conniving opponent, and who knows what kind of a deal Dewey would eventually cook up with the Japanese war lords? In short, a Dewey victory would tend to set in motion a wave of reaction all over the capitalist world. The bitter experiences after World War I should be sufficient warning to us of how dangerous such a reactionary offensive would be.

The Dewey-Hoover-Taft-Vandenberg-Hearst-McCormick aggressively imperialist forces are trying to achieve their policy of world domination in three general phases. First, they plotted to seize control of the Republican Party as their base of operations, and they have succeeded in accomplishing this. Second, they are trying to capture the American Government in the election, and with no small chance of success. Third, once with the vast resources of the powerful United States under their command, they would set out, along the general lines indicated in this article, to achieve economic, political and, if need be, military, world domination.

In view of the badly weakened state of the capitalist system, the great strength of the world democratic forces organized by this war, the deep-seated hatred of the world peoples against Hitler-like attempts of great powers to seize world control, and the imperative need of the world for policies of economic and political, as well as military, collaboration among the great states, it is idiotic for sections of American finance capital to cultivate dreams of world imperialist conquest. For these could only lead to economic chaos, the rebirth of fascism, the launching of the world towards a World War III, and the shattering of the world capitalist system. But that these people are nursing such imperialist illusions it would be most dangerous to ignore. Nor should we be surprised that re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actionary circles are developing their boundless schemes of American conquest, in the face of every contrary reality. For it was precisely such big capitalist cliques as these that, in the various lands, by placing their class greed above the true interests of their nations and the world, were responsible for two terrible world wars, the recent devastating economic crisis, and the growth of the fascist nightmare, all within one generation. There would be no imimperialist folly too great for the Dewey forces to commit, could they but grab control of the powerful United States Government.

The United States, in view of the critical situation of the world and the great strength of this country, will inevitably be called upon to exercise a high degree of world economic and political leadership. But if this leadership is to redound to the benefit of our country and the world, it must not be exercised in the reckless imperialist sense that the Dewey forces have in mind, but along the lines of world collaboration being followed now by the Roosevelt Administration. Will the vast power of the United States be used constructively in the world or shortsightedly (and disastrously) in an attempt to further the interests of a few powerful sections of American capitalists? This is the main question the American voters have to decide in the November elections.

The American Presidential elections, therefore, have not only national, but international significance. It is of the greatest importance to our country and the world that there should stand at the head of our nation an administration which would work responsibly with the rest of the world for the solution of the tremendous problems now confronting it, instead of an administration which would exploit all the difficulties for the imperialist advantage of the reactionary monopolists of the United States. The Teheran program of Roosevelt would open the way to a new era of world progress; the Dewey program of American imperialist domination could only lead to disaster, for us as well as for the world generally.

The American people confront an especially heavy responsibility in this election to defeat Dewey and to return Roosevelt to power for another four years. To do this is the task of the workers, the farmers, the city middle classes, and also those sections of the capitalists who are not blinded by the lurid light of imperialist expansion. But this victory can be made certain only on the basis of a thorough-going exposure of the imperialist ambitions of the Dewey forces, making it clear that, as the Communist Political Association puts it, the central issue is for or against Teheran. Dewey's pretended agreement with the basic national and international policies of Roosevelt must be unmasked and the real issue between the two camps brought to light. The great masses of the American people are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anti-fascist, anti-imperialist and peace-loving; and they will vote Roosevelt back into office with large majorities, provided they are educated to the vital importance of the questions at stake. It is a weakness, however, that this mass educational work is not generally being done. For the most part, the Democratic leaders are taking Dewey's hypocritical stand pretty much at its face value and are allowing the election debate to turn chiefly around secondary issues and personal questions.

Victory for Roosevelt must be decisive. Roosevelt requires a solid Congressional majority to back him up. Otherwise, we shall run the grave danger of having the deplorable situation where the combined Republican-Southern Tory Democrat forces will be able to sabotage and prevent the carrying through of the progressive economic and political measures imperatively necessary to meet the world's gigantic problems. The Dewey-Hoover-Taft-McCormick-Hearst-Smith imperialists must be overwhelmed and routed.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CERTAIN LESSONS OF VERSAILLES

BY PROF. A. TRAININ

NOW that the hour of Hitler Germany's utter defeat is drawing near, the question of punishing the war criminals—the instigators and executors of abominable atrocities—is more and more assuming practical significance. The nations demand that these criminals suffer the punishment they deserve. However, here and there in the foreign press voices are raised advocating leniency toward the war criminals. Essentially speaking, these voices are calling for a repetition of the mistakes of Versailles and for leaving in Germany the dangerous seeds of new wars and new atrocities.

Yet of all the lessons furnished by the Versailles Peace Treaty, not the least deserving of attention is the instructive history of how the Germans guilty of crimes in 1914-1918 became, with the connivance of the victors, their own judges and tried themselves for their own crimes.

The crimes perpetrated by the Germans in the war of 1914-1918 were very considerable. The investigation commissions which were set up at the time in France, Britain, Belgium and Russia established numerous cases of the slaughter by Germans of unarmed civilians, the shooting of war prisoners and the destruction of towns and villages.

When Germany was defeated and the time came to conclude the peace treaty, the Germans' crimes were not forgotten. A special section of the Versailles Treaty (Seven, "Sanctions") proclaimed the criminal responsibility of Kaiser Wilhelm and his confederates. Article 227 of the Treaty publicly accused Wilhelm Hohenzollern of grave outrages against international morality and the sanctity of treaties, and declared that a special court would be set up to try him.

Thus the Versailles Treaty bluntly and plainly proclaimed to the world, horror-stricken by four years of war and by the German atrocities, that the guilty would be tried and punished. But things turned out otherwise.

The question of trying Wilhelm was decided simply and swiftly, without prolonged diplomatic correspondence. On January 15, 1919 the Allied powers adressed a note to Holland, to which Wilhelm had fled, demanding the surrender of the ex-Kaiser as a violator of the sacred principles of international morality and law. Holland refused. The mighty, victorious powers which brought Germany to her knees and dictated their will to a large part

* Translated from *Krasnaya Zvesda*, September 19, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Europe could not find the means of compelling Holland to submit to the demands of justice and surrender Wilhelm. The Germans realized that the victorious powers were not particularly anxious to find those means. The upshot was that the trial of Wilhelm, solemnly proclaimed by the Versailles Treaty, went no farther than the pages of that treaty.

Equally futile proved the efforts to secure the triumph of justice in the case of Wilhelm's confederates who were guilty of war crimes.

Article 228 of the Versailles Treaty reserved for the Allied powers the right to demand the surrender of Wilhelm's accomplices guilty of violation of the rules and laws of war. In pursuance of this Article, on February 3, 1920, Millerand presented a note to the German representative in Paris, Baron Lensner, enumerating the persons who were to be surrendered as war criminals. In all, the Allied powers demanded 890 persons, including Hindenburg, Ludendorff, Mackensen, Admiral Tirpitz and the former Reichskanzler Bethmann-Hollweg.

Baron Lensner refused to transmit this note to the German government and resigned. In Germany itself an organized movement of protest was started against the surrender of these persons to the Allies. The German government sent one note and memorandum after another to Paris, asserting that the surrender of the war criminals was "impracticable," and left no stone unturned to prove its assertion.

The Germany which had disgraced herself with crimes against the laws and customs of warfare, now talked of her "national honor" and "national dignity." "The honor and dignity of the German people" —the German government wrote in the memorandum—"cannot reconcile itself to the surrender to foreign courts of their countrymen accused of the crimes of war."

Taking her cue from the attitude of certain leading circles in the victor countries, Germany strenuously tried to frighten the authors of the Versailles Treaty with the bogey of political and social complications.

"The German Government"—one of the notes said—"must particularly point out that the demand to surrender the accused will undoubtedly cause the severest disturbances in political and economic spheres."

Germany's juridical position was absolutely unsound: Germany had not only signed the Versailles Peace Treaty, but by a special national act had endowed it with the force of German internal law. The German Constituent Assembly of July 16, 1919, endorsed and published the Versailles Treaty. But the decision of the question did not lie in judicial argumentation; it was not a doubt as to the legality of the demand to surrender the criminals, but fear of the danger of political and social upheavals—a danger deliberately exaggerated by Germany—that softened the hearts of the victors.

The German government was not slow to take advantage of the changed situation and proposed a compromise: "The German government declares that it is prepared to institute criminal proceedings in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany against those persons whose surrender the Allied powers intend to demand." Germany vowed that "the prosecution would be conducted with all desirable rigor and impartiality."

The German government sweetened the pill for the Allied powers by declaring that any government interested would be given the right to take a direct part in the trial. Germany's proposal was accepted, and in violation of Article 228 of the Versailles Treaty a German court was set up in Leipzig for the trial of the German war criminals. Here are a few illustrations of the character of this German-engineered "trial":

In May, 1921, the Leipzig court tried the case of Unteroffizier Heinen, accused of cruelty to French war prisoners. He was found guilty and sentenced to 10 months' imprisonment. Another war criminal, Mueller, was sentenced to five months' imprisonment.

On June 29, 1921, the Leipzig court heard the case of General Stenger, charged with having issued on August 16, 1914, an order to his troops to shoot wounded French soldiers. "From today on," the order read, "no more prisoners are to be taken. All prisoners, wounded and not wounded, are to be killed. . . . We must not leave a single living enemy behind us." Notwithstanding the fact that the order was fully authenticated at the trial, the Leipzig court exonerated General Stenger on the grounds that the written order was not filed in the records of the trial. That is the way Germans tried Germans.

That is the way the trial went off in Leipzig. That is the way Germany kept her promise to try the war criminals with "all desirable rigor and impartiality."

While agreeing to the Leipzig trials, the Allies in one of their notes warned Germany that they reserved to themselves the right to decide whether the procedure proposed by the Germans would not in the long run result in the accused escaping just punishment for all their misdeeds, in which case—the authors of the Versailles Treaty threatened—the Allies would exercise their right to resort to their own courts. But these threats, too, remained on paper: not one of the persons liable to be surrendered to the Allies was tried by the latter in their "own courts." The Leipzig trials were a travesty of justice, as the Soviet press bluntly called it at the time.

If these facts are considered in the proper light, it may definitely be said that one of the reasons for the monstrous orgy of Nazi crimes in this war is the fact that the Germans escaped punishment for their crimes in the war of 1914-1918.

The role played by the Soviet Union in the war against Hitler Germany guarantees it a due influence in the settlement—together with the Allies—of all post-war problems. And this in its turn is the best guarantee that the history of 1919-1921 in the matter of the responsibility for war crimes will not be repeated. Hitler, his clique and all persons guilty of heinous crimes will suffer the full punishment they merit.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROBLEMS OF CLUB LEADERSHIP AND DEMOCRACY IN THE C.P.A.

BY JOHN WILLIAMSON

THE complex problems of the post-election period and of the whole year of 1945 will necessitate the strengthening of the Communist Political Association leadership in the clubs and County Committees. This leadership must be prepared to assume even greater responsibilities than it has at present. Final victory in the war, not only in Europe, but in the Far East, remains the number one task. Nevertheless, we must already prepare to face and find satisfactory answers to all the problems of reconversion, particularly those of the war workers. We must become conversant with the problems raised at Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods and as a part of the national unity forces work out a common policy in regard to them. These are problems concerning America's role in the future world organization to secure the peace; the methods of assuring a full-blast peacetime production, with full employment and still higher standards of living, through increased foreign and domestic markets. To these must be added the integration into industry of returned veterans, the necessity of an adjustment of traditional seniority rules as applied to the new millions of Negro workers who have entered industry for the first time; the achievement of a firm unity of labor and the veterans with the Negroes and women who responded to the call for production soldiers. The trade union movement, retaining its wartime strength and achieving a still greater maturity and unity, must be in the forefront of the nation. The C.P.A. will continue its responsible role in the creation of clarity on the solution of these problems. Our association must continue to contribute its maximum efforts through the activity of its members as individuals, and through the independent work of the C.P.A. itself, to the organizing of the American people in activities appropriate for the situation. Therefore, in preparing for club elections in January, it is clear that the most serious approach is necessary to the election of an able leadership that is ready and willing to study and learn in the course of leading the work.

The Development of Leadership in Review

Throughout the twenty-five years

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of our existence as an organized Communist movement, and especially during the period since 1930, our ability to meet the numerous and difficult tasks before the American working class, and to influence and help guide its development into a decisive force in the life of the American nation, has been intimately connected with our ability to develop, promote and train new Communist leadership.

Our guiding policy was established years ago by Earl Browder when he declared:

"Communist Party policy depends for effectiveness upon the leading personnel which must translate it into life. Our policy can never rise above the political level of the Party leading committees."

Each new period in the history of labor and the nation created new tasks in the development of Communist leadership. But the common feature in each of these periods was the emphasis on improving the quality of the work of our cadres so as to enhance the contribution of the Communists to the development and consolidation of the mass movement. This held true, despite the variety of problems our organization faced. During the economic crisis of 1930-33 all forces who showed promise of leadership and had demonstrated loyalty to the newly united Communist movement were thrown into the struggle throughout the country, even though they had no formal Party education. In 1933-36, it was necessary to train and promote to leadership hundreds of new young native forces from the shops who came forward in the great mass struggles out of which the great industrial unions were born. In 1936-39, when the new unions became powerful, gained improvements, and an unprecedented unity of all democratic forces developed, great emphasis was placed by our organization on the mastering of theory, initiative in independent Communist activities as part of the democratic front, and on more intense political vigilance and higher standards of personal conduct.

This was followed by the period of 1939-41, during which the policies of Chamberlain and Munich dominated the thinking of the capitalist world. During this period every American Communist leader was put to the test of fighting for a correct policy against the immediate current of the main stream of official policy, and of adopting completely new methods of work. This period was also marked by persecution of Communists, especially leading Communists. Then came the present period of the war of national liberation, when the Communists subordinated everything to victory in the war, contributing over 11,000 members to the armed forces and every one of their remaining members to the home front, whether as production soldiers or community war workers. This period brought forward completely new, inexperienced and untrained forces, mainly women, to leadership in clubs and in county and state organizations.

Although we are still in this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present period when the war must yet be won, we can already look forward and prepare for the next stage, following victory. This approaching period will present new, complex tasks, fusion of the present club and county leaders with the returned C.P.A.-member veterans. But the very course of meeting tasks and activities of the year 1945 will be the occasion for the present type of leadership to attain still greater maturity and efficiency. Such further development of present-day leadership, especially of our women members and production soldiers, will make possible a hundred-fold strengthening of our over-all leadership, when the thousands of Communists return from the armed services with their still greater experience, political consciousness and leadership qualities gained in the course of the war against the Axis.

In the period since the C.P.A. Convention, a number of problems have been the subject of much discussion and should receive the increased attention of the C.P.A. membership and functionaries. They are:

1. The need for building and strengthening the C.P.A. and the way to accomplish this;

2. The stature of C.P.A. club and county leaders;

3. The need for greater democracy in helping the growth and development of cadres.

Let us examine each of these problems separately.

Why There Is Need for Building the C.P.A.

The contributions of the C.P.A. and its members to the war effort and to the solution of the difficult problems confronting the labor movement and the nation are well known to all enlightened citizens. Nevertheless, there is a present need—and with the complex problems in the post-war era this will be multiplied—for a larger C.P.A. to influence the thinking and actions of the labor and people's movements.

Nearly one-third of our resident members are recruits from the membership campaign of the early months of this year. A considerable number of club officers have been members for less than eighteen months. On the one hand, this shows our confidence in promoting new forces to leadership, but at the same time, it indicates their lack of certain experience. These club leaders possess the asset of having participated in the great election struggle of 1944 and of having fought for the life-and-death policies of the labor movement and the nation. Upon these new club leaders will fall the responsibility of leading to success the proposed membership campaign due to start in February of next year.

To this end we shall organize during the months of December and January a well-prepared political-educational campaign among our members and functionaries. This campaign will endeavor to enlighten the membership in regard to the role and function of the C.P.A., to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consolidate our ranks politically and organizationally, and to prepare our present club officers for the enrollment campaign. Above all, the December-January activity will strive to deepen the members' understanding of the possibilities of such an enrollment campaign and of the political conditions and relations under which it will be conducted.

We must enlighten our membership as to why we build the C.P.A. We must clear away a certain political confusion with regard to the need or possibility of a separate life, existence and activity of the C.P.A., while our members actively participate in all mass organizations and movements. Too many of our members see a contradiction between our emphasis on the common interests that we hold with the democratic camp and its various organized bodies, and our emphasis on the necessity for an independent life and activity of the C.P.A. We must explain this apparent "contradiction" in which we emphasize what we have in common with the democratic camp and not what differentiates us, and yet our specific appeal to join the C.P.A. is and must be based on precisely that which differentiates us—our Marxist understanding and consequent ability to contribute to the enlightenment and organizing of labor and the people—in the interest of the people and the nation. We must make this clear in full consonance with the main objective of stressing our identity with the democratic camp.

Our members would be insufficiently prepared for the Recruiting Campaign if we only emphasized the objective possibilities of today and the contributions of the Communists. There are specific difficulties that act as obstacles to the growth of the C.P.A. Our members must understand the nature and method of overcoming these difficulties in the course of their mass work.

In many sections of the democratic camp in our nation, in contrast with France, Italy, Yugoslavia, Greece, etc., the Communists are not yet accepted as an integral part of the nation. While progress has been made, full understanding must be speeded up. Furthermore, there are new tendencies in some sections of the win-the-war camp, as evidenced in Walter Lippmann's latest work, that project the idea of liquidating the Communist movement in the post-war era.

Furthermore, as our members in ever larger numbers correctly become an integral part of all mass organizations, there have been tendencies, even more than in the past, of concealing our existence as Communists in the trade unions, P.A.C., A.L.P., and other mass organizations.

We must convince our members of the present-day need of organizing and building the C.P.A. on the basis of the contributions we have made to the labor movement and the nation in connection with each decisive new issue. Here it is important to show the connection between our ideas and our practical work as a C.P.A. Hence, we must popularize more our own contributions as well as the role and con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tributions of the Communist movement in other countries. We must show that just as the defense of the nation required the contributions of the Communists, so also the post-war reconstruction problems and perspectives require the contribution and collaboration of the Communists.

To continue to fulfill adequately our role as a Marxist organization and further to build the C.P.A., as well as to make it more difficult for reactionaries to attack every mass organization where Communists are active, it is necessary to fight for the right of Communists to be publicly accepted. Side by side with that, we must systematically liquidate the self-imposed "underground" status of some Communists in the mass organizations. If our members do not acknowledge being Communists to their co-workers in trade unions, political mass organizations, etc., this, when coupled with the necessary absence of independent Communist mass activities, will result in a loss of C.P.A. membership, undermine our general influence and make it easier for Red-baiters to attack the mass organizations and accuse us of trying to "capture" them. That is why we must intensify our public political propaganda work in the name of the C.P.A., and simultaneously convince our members in a natural and normal way to be known as Communists in their mass organizations and in the course of their mass work to promote and sell the *Worker*, Earl Browder's *Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace*, etc., and to recruit members into the Association. We must help our members to function this way by considering how legally to wipe out the remaining bans on Communists in employment, and to wipe out the anti-Communist clauses in trade union constitutions.

The Stature of C.P.A. Club Leadership

To lead and service the C.P.A. in the community, with its manifold political and organizational responsibilities and activities—whether in the Club (which many times is a mass organization in its own right) or on a city or state scale—is a responsibility that demands political stature and capacity far exceeding the average mass organization official.

A recent survey of the stability of Club leadership showed that during this year there was an average fluctuation of one third of those elected. In New York the fluctuation was still greater. Only a minority of these releases were caused by induction into the armed forces or migration due to employment in war industries. This condition reflects several things:

1. There is not a serious enough approach to the responsibility and dignity of leadership in a C.P.A. Club. There is still need for creating the atmosphere of responsibility, where one serves out with honor his or her term of elected office and thus fulfills responsibility to the membership.

2. Leadership today requires in addition to political and organizational ability, specialized knowledge and experience in regard to various

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

activities, such as legislation, reconversion and veterans' problems. Therefore, there is need of greater assistance to the newly elected functionary. This includes political help through classes, political discussions in the course of day-to-day work, suggested readings, a system of organization-educational instructors. Approaching the problem from a different angle, we find in planning campaigns and working out directives from top committees there must be recognition of special problems, such as long hours of work, exhaustion, care of children by our functionaries who are overwhelmnigly women, special summer problems for these same mothers, etc.

3. We must overcome the fear or hesitations of shop workers that they are not competent for the task of leadership, in comparison to the most articulate office worker or professional. We must systematically encourage the shop worker—who feels at home and speaks out freely in his shop committee, local union, or A.L.P. Club—to know that he is particularly fitted to participate in the Club or County leadership. Simultaneously we should encourage the non-worker member to contribute to the C.P.A. by participating in the work and leadership of the Club, but never at the expense of the shop worker.

Further Development of Democracy

The fullest development and maximum practice of democracy is a means of stimulating the growth of new leadership. While attendance at leadership classes should be encouraged, few of these classes will be full time. That means that the majority of our new leaders will develop in the course of self-study and participation in club discussions and functions, as well as in mass work.

Our Club meetings have not yet reached that high level of discussion where full exchange of opinion on a report takes place and in the course of which maximum clarity is achieved and a common viewpoint established. In many cases, even differences of opinion that may exist are not clearly crystallized. This does not arise in relation to day-to-day work where opinions are expressed more freely, but usually in relation to questions of basic policy. The failure of the members to express themselves at Club meetings does not mean that such members do not enter into discussion. On the contrary, extended discussions will be held between two or three members outside the meetings, without benefit of the collective opinion. It is urgently necessary that there be created an atmosphere in the Club that will encourage full expression of opinion and maximum participation in discussions. Creation of this atmosphere is a manifold problem. It includes the original presentation of problems without that air of finality which automatically prohibits discussions. It necessitates learning the technique of presenting the main kernel of thought, without exhausting the subject. It makes necessary less repetition of general phrases and an effort to apply the general thought to the local conditions. It may be necessary in some clubs to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

institute an "Information Please" type of discussion, involving the club membership. The decisive thing is to encourage free and maximum expression of opinion, even though it is a different opinion. Only through such discussions will the maximum clarity be achieved and, as a result, maximum exertion of energy and activity in the application of the policies decided upon in discussion.

A function and manifestation of democracy is also maximum activity. We cannot be satisfied with a situation in which in large clubs of 200 to 600 members, only 25 per cent are in attendance or participate in discussions or in elections. This does not mean that the sole answer is in 100 per cent attendance at club meetings. *The answer is in the involvement of all the members in one or another form of activity under the guidance of the club.* That is why activity committees are so decisive. This can be further supplemented by classes, forums, book review circles, *Worker* clubs in shops or local unions, or discussion groups of unionists on the basis of specific or general problems. When everyone is involved in activity under the guidance of the club, there will be maximum political discussions and the club will become a beehive of activity, even though there is not full attendance.

We have correctly encouraged large community clubs in order to attain the advantages of the cooperative effort of several hundreds of Communists in public mass activities. However, we see clubs reaching the size of 500 to 700 in membership. There can be no blueprint of size to which every club must conform. Generally speaking, the size of the club should depend upon the ability of its present Executive to give it effective leadership. But even with a capable Executive there are certain limits of size beyond which there can be neither democratic functioning of the club, effective involvement of all its members in activity or proper political guidance and development of its membership. Experience has shown that only a few clubs with a membership of 500 function with maximum effectiveness but that the majority (considering the inexperience of many of our club leaders) are more effective with a maximum membership of 300. As we said, there should be no "blueprint" approach to the solution of this question. Rather let size be determined by results of present-day functioning. It should be clear that it is possible and proper to have more than one large club in the same area.

To the extent that there is understanding and solution of these stated three problems, will the C.P.A. be able more effectively to bring forward and develop its leading cadres and fulfill its responsibilties to labor and the nation.

General Characteristics of Communist Leadership

Twenty-five years of Communist history and experience in the United States have resulted in the development of certain basic tenets of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communist leadership toward which each of us should strive.

We can be proud of the Communist leaders over the years and of the present-day Communist leaders, whether on the far-flung battlefields of war or in the varied battlefields of the home front, who are politically maturing in the midst of helping to solve the most complex and varied problems confronting the working people and the nation.

There are three particular qualities of Communist leadership that the present-day situation especially emphasizes for all functionaries and Communist leaders. These are:

1. A fundamental understanding of Marxism, as the living and creative science of society, that enables us boldly to meet each new situation with appropriate policy, while we guide ourselves constantly by the principles of scientific Socialism.

2. The exercise of initiative in facing each new situation, the assumption of responsibility and the display of courage under difficulties, the art of working collectively, and the manifestation of modesty regarding one's own role coupled with boldness in inspiring confidence in the people.

3. The ability to think always in terms of the people—especially of labor and its role in the progress of the nation; the ability to manifest love of country and devotion to, and close contact with, the working people.

In all these respects, the American Communists, under the leadership of Earl Browder, have demonstrated ability. Not only has Browder charted the path for the development of Communist cadres, but he is exemplary in his mastery of these three particular qualities of Communist leadership. Browder's contributions at each decisive turning point are too numerous to relate, but the best examples of his contributions are the book, *Teheran —Our Path in War and Peace,* on which his historic report to the national convention of the Communist Political Association is based; the Preamble to the Constitution of the C.P.A.; and his closing remarks to the January, 1944, session of the National Committee of the Communist Party. In those remarks he stated:

"We have to be humble and learn from history; we have to learn from facts and never try to impose our preconceptions upon history. That is one of the first lessons of Marxism, which we have to relearn afresh if we are to make the fullest possible use of this tremendous intellectual arsenal that has been given to us by the great thinkers and leaders of the Socialist-Communist movement. We cannot rise to the heights that are necessary to master this historical moment through intellectual arrogance. We must be prepared to refresh ourselves according to the necessities of the period into which history has brought us, and, above all, we must understand that history never yet has been known to follow anyone's private blueprint. The great turning points of history are in this sense always unexpected; there is always something new, something fresh in them that has to be fundamentally evaluated. We are in such a period today.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"This requires from everyone who aspires to leading functions a deep feeling of responsibility, personal responsibility for the successful conduct of the smallest tasks of daily work, such as the successful conclusion of our recruiting drive, for example, but above all, it requires intellectual responsibility, the responsibility for each one of us individually to think through and master these problems."

To be a nominee for office in an organization which sets such standards of leadership as does ours, is indeed a high honor. To the extent that the preparations for club elections in January, now a constitutional requirement, are made an integral part of the political-educational campaign being planned for December and January, it will be possible to emphasize the importance and dignity of club leadership. Only thus will the membership be encouraged to sponsor and bring forward for consideration, discussion and election, not one, but many candidates for each office, in order that the will of the club be fully reflected in the final choice of leadership. For the Communist Political Association to meet its tasks in the interests of labor and the nation in the decisive year of 1945, its clubs must bring forward their best representatives for leadership.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AS WE FACE RECONVERSION

BY GEORGE MORRIS

THE task of conversion to war production came upon America almost with the suddenness with which Pearl Harbor was bombed. We had our difficulties with some sections of industry and even had to cut off supplies from some substantial groups of industrialists bebefore they made up their minds really to get into war production. But when all was said and done, the miracle of production was achieved, despite our difficulties and serious weaknesses. America fully filled the role of an "arsenal of democracy," due to the sheer weight of its immense economy, due to management-labor cooperation and almost 100 per cent fulfillment of labor's no-strike pledge, and due to government direction and organization.

Now we face an "unwinding" process—the battle of reconversion, and, as is quite evident to even a casual observer, the task of expanding our economy considerably beyond pre-war levels. This task did not come upon us with the suddenness of Pearl Harbor. Its problems emerged and became clearer as victory over Germany became more apparent. We are already sliding into at least some minor aspects of reconversion. The government is already disposing of some of its surplus property, although we are at the peak of the war's fighting. Controls have been relaxed on materials for many types of consumer needs. A number of manufacturers have already shifted from war to peace-time products.

Moreover, the end of hostilities in Europe will eliminate only one of the war fronts. A large portion of the war output will continue to supply the Pacific operations. Thus, it is apparent that our reconversion program will, of necessity, go hand in hand with the war program. The former will progress as the needs of the latter decrease. But our fundamental guiding policy for reconversion—our post-war sights—must be set now if we are not to go off on the wrong track toward another and far more serious Hoover depression.

The question before us is: will America undertake the battle of reconversion with the same will, unity and mobilization of resources that assured the success of our war program?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no scarcity of talk about the problem of reconversion. It is the dominating issue in the minds of the people. Everybody is worried over post-war job prospects. This is reflected in a more extensive interest in post-war planning than has ever been shown by Americans in any problem. There is hardly an organization of business or labor that isn't delving into it through research and special study. Conferences on post-war problems have swept through the entire country. An indication of this among businessmen is the growth of the Committee for Economic Development to branches in 2,000 communities with a membership of some 50,000 businessmen.

The Problem Stated

Briefly, the problem is as follows: the country's labor force today is about 62 million, including some 11 million in the armed services. This compares to 46.6 million in 1940 which included 600,000 in the armed forces. But in 1940 we had about eight million unemployed, while today there are hardly any unemployed. Department of Commerce experts estimate that if 1946 will be the first post-war year, the number expected to be at work or in search of jobs will be 59.5 million. If we take the common assumption that 2.5 million men will be retained in the armed services, there remain 57 million to be provided with jobs, or 11 million above the number that were employed in 1940.

But that is only part of the story. The 46 million workers in 1940 produced goods and services amounting to 97 billions. The Department of Commerce estimates that efficiency and technological development during the war would enable 55 million workers (they allow two million for "normal" unemployment) to turn out goods and services amounting to 140 billion annually in terms of 1940 prices. Thus, a manpower increase of about 20 per cent would increase output by about 45 per cent. This is on the basis of the regular work week.

If, therefore, the level of output in 1946 would be no higher than the production level of 1940, the number of unemployed is bound to be above 15 million, according to the estimate of the Committee for Economic Development. Other sources regard this estimate as conservative and place the likely figure as high as 19 million. At any rate, the objective is to find a market that could absorb the products of from 15 to 19 million workers. It must not be forgotten that 1940 was a "good" peacetime year with a national income about equal to that of 1929.

Another way to put the problem is that it is one of finding new markets to take the place of the one customer of American industry whose purchases will almost suddenly drop from $90 billion annually to a figure less than a third of that. Prof. Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard University, who is head of the C.E.D.'s research division,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

warns that if this market gap is not filled, "nearly twenty million" will be looking for work "within a year after the firing ceases." Slichter speaks for a businessmen's organization.

Estimates on the magnitude of the problem, and consequently on what our economic sights should be, differ. National income goals range from below 100 billion to 200 billion, depending, of course, upon an organization's outlook.

Approaching the Problem

How is this problem being approached?

Roughly, there are two basic lines of approach, much along the lines of Earl Browder's prediction shortly after the Teheran conference, when he said that the post-war perspective is shaping as one of for or against the policy outlined at Teheran. This does not mean that all who either favor or resist the Teheran line are consciously doing so. Practically all of organized labor is behind the policies of Teheran; but a great many in its ranks are not fully aware of their full implications, especially their relation to production, to jobs, and we might even say to the very existence of a local union.

This holds even more true in business circles. It is common to find a businessman who is fully interested in every step that would insure a long and durable peace, in every measure that would maintain economic stability and smooth the way to foreign trade. But those may be purely practical steps in his mind, without any relation to the historic Teheran conference, or the subsequent meetings at Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks.

Americans are today realizing, more than even in the past, that America cannot be at peace, stable and prosperous, unless the rest of the world too, progresses in that direction.

As Browder pointed out, the Teheran agreement promises two lines of development for our economy and assurance of jobs. It opens the way for those world conditions that would enable us to expand foreign markets to that extraordinary extent which we must have if we are really to find a substitute for a substantial part of our present world market. Secondly, it promises that long period of peace that is absolutely essential for domestic economic expansion and advancement of the standards and purchasing power of the mass of people.

The President Outlines a Perspective

President Roosevelt has given the country the rough outlines of a post-war perspective. His "New Bill of Rights" in last January's message to Congress projects the "new frontier" toward which Americans can strive. These rights are:

1. "The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries, or shops or farms or mines of the nation;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. "The right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation;

3. "The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living;

4. "The right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and domination by monopolies at home or abroad;

5. "The right of every family to a decent home;

6. "The right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health;

7. "The right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident and unemployment;

8. "The right to a good education."

A study of those rights shows that they cover practically every field of our economy. If put into effect, they would spell security for worker, farmer and businessman. The eight points correspond to the basic outline of a whole trend of post-war discussion or planning that has swept through the country. Foremost in this group is labor, both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. Close behind are progressive professional and liberal groups.

From numerous labor conferences, discussions and much independent research, there has emerged a great deal of literature elaborating upon the President's outline.

The "labor" point of view of reconversion was outlined by President Philip Murray at a number of recent C.I.O. conventions. He called for:

Continuance of the aircraft industry on the basis of mass production of privately-owned planes; federal government subsidies for the construction of 6,000 municipally-owned airports.

Further expansion of the automobile industry and highways; construction of a network of superhighways.

Modernization of the railway system and renovation of much of its equipment; elimination of grade crossings.

Thoroughfares from the centers of cities to outskirts to eliminate bottlenecks.

A housing program of 1,500,000 new homes every year for a period of at least ten years, with bold city planning along lines of decentralizing metropolitan areas and providing modern and most convenient facilities.

Rural electrification, with such power developments as the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, through which farmers would get cheap electrification.

Expansion of health protection and a vast program of construction of hospitals and laboratories.

Expansion of our entire educational system; construction of a great many schools and a large increase in employment of teachers.

The second part of his outline and proposals stresses the imperative need of expansion of foreign trade, especially on the basis of re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

construction needs in war-torn lands, and industrialization of China, India and Latin America, with the government underwriting foreign credits. This emphasis on expansion of foreign trade reveals Murray's outlook as being far in advance of that of the old-line trade union officials.

Murray sees the possibility of labor, employers and the government getting together upon such a program. To show that it is possible, he points to the joint action he and shipbuilder Henry Kaiser took when they presented to the President a plan for 6,000 airports. In his Labor Day message, Murray said that "this planning calls for close cooperation between government, industry and labor under coordinated and purposeful direction."

A cornerstone of Murray's post-war program is a wage policy that would sustain purchasing power. This calls, first, for revision of the "Little Steel" formula; secondly, for a guaranteed annual wage.

Some Partial Steps

The main features of the program outlined by Murray—and the A. F. of L. post-war program is much like it—were contained in the Kilgore-Murray Reconversion Bill. Labor united behind this bill. But other groups of the population were only beginning to recognize their own interest in the measure, when Congress killed it. Only the most consistent supporters of the President voted for it.

Congress even refused to approve the modest proposal of $20 unemployment benefits for 26 weeks a year that War Mobilization Director James F. Byrnes suggested. The whole problem of providing for masses of jobless as cutbacks take sudden effect was left to the states. Congress also turned down the proposal to put the three million federal employees under jobless insurance.

Congress ran away from its responsibility. It is true that bills have been passed to regulate contract termination policy and settlement of financial obligations on war orders, surplus property disposal, and federal loans to states to underwrite their unemployment insurance obligations in the event of sudden mass layoffs. It is true also that the "G.I. Bill" covers a series of security measures and aid for returning soldiers. But basic measures, such as those incorporated in the Kilgore-Murray Bill, which call for government initiative and guidance towards a high level of production and employment at decent standards, were either shelved or killed.

Nor is there very much in sight from local and state governments for programs of public works, housing and like projects which might take up unemployment during the transition stage of reconversion. New York City is among the few notable exceptions where this is given consideration.

Despite legislative limitation, the Administration went ahead with a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of steps to prepare an orderly reconversion to cushion the shock of cutbacks as much as possible. The activity that developed around the celebrated Brewster Aeronautical Corporation case has undoubtedly been of far greater positive value than the harm that came from its shocking example. The sudden cancellation of plant orders by the Navy closing three plants and throwing most of the 16,000 workers out of employment in several days brought a coast-to-coast cry for a planned policy such as would have in view the human element and the prospects of new employment and early reconversion to peacetime output.

The result was the issuance of directives calling for adequate notice of cutbacks, and regard for a whole series of factors. War orders have been reviewed. War Mobilization Director Byrnes reports that authorized expenditures amounting to $18,000,000,000 have been cancelled.

On the other hand, the ban was lifted on production of many civilian products, for which materials are increasingly being released as the status of military supplies makes that possible. Hardly a day passes that does not bring an announcement of further lifting of bans on civilian products and release of materials that were on the "critical" list.

Civilian output, even where released, is still mainly restricted by a manpower shortage, because war industries absorb dismissed workers without much delay. The transfer to civilian fields is expected to be more significant in coming months. Another Administration step was to set up an agency to direct disposal of government plants, machinery and surplus materials. That committee, according to Byrnes, is guided by the objective of placing that property in such private hands as will assure its utilization for maximum employment.

The Perspectives of Hooverism

All such measures, however, can only serve to cushion the effect of dislocations. They cannot meet such serious emergencies as the expected dismissal of four to five million workers after V-E (victory in Europe) Day when war production will be slashed by from 40 to 50 per cent. The absence of the Kilgore-Murray Bill will then really be felt, unless the new Congress enacts a similar program.

There is a still more fundamental question: do we merely want to slide back into the old groove and into another depression when the post-war deferred buying boom spends itself?

The Senate debate on the Kilgore-Murray Bill gave evidence that powerful forces are pulling for a post-war policy that conflicts sharply with that of the President, and the whole perspective of Teheran.

Senator Robert Taft was most outspoken for that "back to normalcy" program, that "orthodox" capitalist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

viewpoint that "free enterprise" (by which he means industry "free" from government "interference" or influence) must take its natural traditional course. Whatever the consequences, they are, in Taft's mind, as inevitable and God-given as a hurricane or sunshine, and human beings can do nothing about them.

Unemployment is a necessary companion to "free enterprise" à la Taft, and it is idle to speak of full employment. Said the Senator:

"I don't think we can employ all the people and certainly not at present wages. If so, if we go on as we are going, we will wreck the United States. The tax burden will be so heavy you'll destroy private enterprise. Then we'll have state socialism."

Giving his own measure of post-war possibilities, Taft set 120 billions as a maximum national income which, in terms of 1940 prices, would come down to a level even below what it was in that year—a level which inevitably promises unemployment of from 15 to 19 million. Taft went further. Taking up the most conservative estimates of post-war budgets, which he said is given as 17 billion dollars annually, he declared that "anything near that amount" would give us "state socialism." He would cut it drastically. What does this mean in the light of heavy government expenditures to maintain an expected much larger peacetime Army and Navy than we had before, and considerable amounts to pay our war debts? It simply means that Taft leaves nothing for public works or expenditures on any such projects and programs as are envisaged in the President's outline of the future.

The same Taft later denounced the Bretton Woods monetary conference as an "international W.P.A" His view of foreign trade looked back to the cut-throat competition and restrictions of the 'twenties when the United States made deals with individual countries. Taft, obviously, counts little on foreign trade.

The Taft outlook reflects the thinking of some very powerful business circles in the country, especially those who have put their resources behind the candidacy of Thomas E. Dewey. It is they who have raised the smokescreen of "free enterprise" to cover up their real objective.

Sewell Avery, president of Montgomery Ward and of U. S Gypsum, gives the viewpoint of this type of capitalist in much plainer language. The *Journal of Commerce* quotes him as follows in its special supplement on "Post-war Planning Now":

"It is not the chief responsibility of business after the war to provide jobs for everyone. A corporation's efficiency is indicated by the number of men it releases from a job, not by the number of men hired."

A Hoover Echo in Labor's Midst

Organized labor's general agree-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment on the outlook for post-war economy should not blind us to the existence of a small but well-entrenched group of labor officials whose position is much closer to that of the Tafts and Averys than to labor's position. William Hutcheson of the Carpenters Union formulated the program of that group in a document published in the March issue of the *American Federationist.* It was reprinted with lavish praise in John L. Lewis' organ. The theoretician of this line is Matthew Woll, Hutcheson's colleague on the A. F. of L.'s Executive Council. All three are Republicans.

The main thesis of the Hutcheson document calls upon labor to join with the most reactionary circles of business in a crusade to "save" what they call "free enterprise," and drive out government influence from economy, collective bargaining or wage policy. The claim is that "free" labor is impossible in a "two-headed nonsuch 'mixed economy.'" Dewey drew his "labor" speeches directly from that document.

Robert J. Watt, international representative of the A. F. of L., blurted out this line even more plainly at the Times Hall forum on October 10 during a discussion on government intervention in economy. "Government intervention has already strangled collective bargaining to death," he said.

The Hutcheson circle dreams of a great reduction from labor's present membership of 13 million, regarding it as inevitable that the line of reconversion will follow the open-shop wage-cutting pattern that came after the last war. Philip Pearl, publicity director of the A. F. of L., voiced this quite plainly in his *A. F. of L. News Letter* column recently, but took comfort in the belief it is the C.I.O. that will "fall apart and be wrecked when the post-war period comes." On that basis he explained why the C.I.O. is so active for Roosevelt. The Republican campaign strategists made the most of that column.

The Constructive Industrialists' View

It would be a mistake to regard the stand expressed by Taft and Avery as the view of all business. Those behind them and Dewey have been strong enough to cause much confusion in the camp of business. But some clarity is breaking through the fog. The most notable examples of businessmen with a constructive post-war outlook are Bernard M. Baruch and Henry Kaiser. The latter outlined a program before the *Herald Tribune* forum that was practically identical with Murray's.

By far, the outstanding organization of business people working for a post-war program is the Committee for Economic Development, of which Paul G. Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corporation, is chairman. The names on its directing bodies read like a roster of big business corporations and associations. The organization is a loose

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one, bound only by a general objective. Undoubtedly the viewpoints within it are as varied as opinions within the whole of American business. But the objectives and views as stated in its literature and so widely spread through the country, are an indicator of the basic trend in its ranks of 50,000 businessmen.

After placing the problem in substantially the same figures as those cited earlier in this article, and warning that 1940 levels mean 15 million jobless, the C.E.D. sets as its objectives: (1) That "a proper target for peace will be 55 million civilian jobs." (2) That American business "will have to raise its sights to much higher levels of production than ever attained before in times of peace." Declaring that mere reconversion to peacetime levels would be "relatively easy," the C.E.D. adds that "what is called for is the much more difficult objective of reconversion accompanied by a substantial and rapid expansion." (3) The C.E.D. warns that unless post-war levels are speedily raised "we shall be threatened with a dissipation of war savings, with the destructive effects of inflation and the paralyzing influence of mass unemployment."

The C.E.D. calls for cooperation with labor, agriculture and for assistance from the government. A 12-point "framework for the post-war economy" prepared for the C.E.D. by its vice-chairman, William B. Benton, who is also vice-president of the University of Chicago, appeared in the October issue of *Fortune*. In publishing the paper, *Fortune* notes that it has the approval of the top leaders of the C.E.D.

Says Mr. Benton on "free enterprise":

"The area of private enterprise should extend to the limit of the ability of private individuals better to serve the common good. Beyond this limit government enterprise can better serve that good."

On labor:

"To compensate for the weakness of their individual bargaining position, wage earners need the right to combine into organizations of collective bargaining."

On depressions:

"Prolonged and severe depressions, as a result of which millions lose their savings and their jobs, cannot be accepted as natural and irremediable phenomena."

Other points call for protection against monopoly practices and approve government provisions through various social security measures for those whom neither private nor public enterprise can provide with a job.

Those views and Senator Taft's are as different as day and night. And yet, both are voiced by spokesmen of business.

We should not overlook some serious gaps in the C.E.D.'s work. Hardly any attention is given to the foreign trade problem. There seems to be an extraordinary over-empha-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sis on the role of salesmanship in making jobs. The immediate post-war market seems to absorb the C.E.D.'s interest. Not much is indicated for a longer range perspective of sustaining purchasing power. Nor does the C.E.D. offer anything more definite for a wage policy and labor relations than its general statement. Nevertheless, within the scope of the C.E.D.'s program, there is much in common with labor and the forces of progress in general.

How are labor unions meeting the problem of reconversion?

Unfortunately, there is little that is more concrete than the general statements of post-war perspectives put forward by the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. The initiative of business seems to be taken for granted in most spheres. There is plenty of worry and discussion on reconversion. There is hardly a labor convention that does not adopt a resolution. But there is still too little in those resolutions that brings the general C.I.O. or A. F. of L. program to the specific industry in question.

A number of organizations have made some headway. The maritime unions of the C.I.O. have agreed on a program that calls for full utilization of the vast merchant tonnage that this country will have. As is quite natural, this is one group of unions that is very sensitive to the importance of foreign trade and the meaning of Teheran.

A similar perspective was advanced at the convention of the C.I.O.'s union of shipbuilding workers. In both of these programs there are proposals on utilization of Liberty Ships, development of fast passenger service, stabilization of manpower and wage policy.

The C.I.O.'s Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers has come forward with proposals involving both conservation of non-ferrous metal resources and continued operation of mines that otherwise face closing because of the vast amount of scrap that the war fronts are returning. This union, too, sees its own interest and life bound up with foreign trade.

Most other unions are still awaiting results of research and study. The problem that did receive most attention in unions was the provision for unemployment benefit payments in the Kilgore-Murray Bill. In fact, little attention was directed to the other provisions of the bill. This narrow view of the bill played into the hands of the propagandists who sought to picture it as a "labor bill" or a "C.I.O. bill" so as to weaken support for it among other sections of the population.

Labor has not counteracted this strategy effectively, because it is divided and is not yet fully convinced that the task of reconversion must bring it together with sections of business, agriculture and middle-class people. The campaign for the bill did not go far beyond labor circles.

Another post-war problem that is receiving increasing attention in the unions, especially in the C.I.O., is the guaranteed annual wage. This

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demand was first projected by the steel workers along with their arguments for revision of the Little Steel formula. The entire wage question now takes on special importance for post-war prospects. The premise that purchasing power must be kept at a high level has meaning only to the degree that a wage policy guarantees it. This is precisely the point that the C.I.O. is stressing. But this is another proposal that is doomed to fail if the drive for it narrows down to labor ranks. Labor is only beginning to realize that one of its big jobs is to show, through big popularization campaigns, that its interest coincides with the country's general welfare.

Some Practical Steps

What steps could further labor's influence in reconversion?

1. Much of the thinking on the problem in many unions is either abstract or just plain worry. Labor must swing its attention to actual examination of the possibilities within specific industries or plants and not be content to trail behind employers.

2. Thousands of management-labor plant committees now ought to direct attention to problems arising from cutbacks and reconversion. They should have an interest both in combatting a letdown in war production and in the plant's future.

3. Labor unions should accept the invitation of the C.E.D. and other such groups to cooperate. This could be a big influence upon the general outlook of this very important organization of small and big business men. Its branches in each city are an important factor in community planning.

4. Unions should not neglect local planning of public projects. Such bodies have been set up in many communities. Labor could be a very important influence in them to see that plans go beyond the talking stage.

5. Some excellent reconversion conferences under labor's initiative, with leaders of business, government, church and other groups attending, have been held in a number of cities. But they are still few. Such conferences are educational within labor ranks; they give a constructive direction to general thinking on the problems of reconversion, and they help to disarm labor-baiters.

6. Many communities, mushrooming into economic importance since Pearl Harbor, face the prospect of becoming ghost towns. Labor initiative in some cases can bring a new outlook for such communities.

7. Problems of conversion to war work are now repeating themselves in reverse. Employers after Pearl Harbor often received war contracts through the pressure and initiative of unions. Now it is common to hear of union delegations going to Washington to ask for release of materials so that their idle plants may begin working on civilian goods.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

8. The provision in the tax law which allows a corporation a refund to make up losses and bring profits up to the 1936-39 level for the first two post-war years holds the threat in many cases of slow resumption of civilian output. This is another situation that calls for the watchfulness and pressure of unions involved.

9. Finally, the Kilgore-Murray Bill and other legislation needed for a constructive reconversion policy, will inevitably be on the agenda again when the new Congress opens. The fight, too, will be renewed, and it will tax the full strength of labor as well as the constructive forces in the ranks of business and agriculture, to win it.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE "REUTHER TACTIC" AND THE FIGHT FOR LABOR-SERVICEMEN UNITY

BY ROBERT THOMPSON

ON September 12, Victor Reuther read a resolution to the United Auto Workers convention calling for unity between workers and servicemen. On September 13, with his participation, the consciously disruptive elements at the convention set out to do a dynamite job on national unity by provoking a fight which came dangerously close to success on the issue of scrapping labor's "no-strike" pledge. This "Reuther tactic" of divorcing the question of labor-servicemen unity from the central task of fighting to defend and extend national unity is the surest formula yet put forward for the isolation of the labor movement from all of its allies, including the men in the armed forces, and veterans. Further, it represents the carrying over into labor's ranks of the basic strategy of the Republican campaign aimed at demobilizing the home front at the moment of the most crucial battles on the fighting fronts.

One of the things that makes this "Reuther tactic" extremely dangerous is the existence of considerable unclarity on the question of the character of present relations between organized labor and men in the armed forces. Many people, including a number who wouldn't touch a Lewis, or a Reuther, or a Trotskyite with a ten-foot pole—nevertheless accept to one or another degree the proposition that labor-servicemen unity is something that exists apart from, and independent of, national unity. In the past, this unclarity has expressed itself in such ways as underestimation of the importance of establishing collaborative relations with the major veterans' organizations, and support to the idea of a labor-sponsored veterans' movement; approaches to veterans and servicemen confined primarily to strictly trade union issues, and failure to present these trade union issues as matters of broad national concern; underestimation of the importance of the struggle for such general democratic measures as full equality of status in the armed forces and in civilian life for Negro servicemen. In the coming showdown fight for official A. F. of L. and C.I.O. policy, and against the "Reuther tactic," these unclarities will, if not eliminated, lend dangerous support to the pro-Lewis forces.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Character of Labor-Servicemen Relations

For the first time since the rise of the organized labor movement as a major force in American life, our country is waging a great war of a truly national character. The role which organized labor is playing in the winning of this war, and in the course of this the relations which it is developing with all other national forces, are in the main without precedent in American history. In no respect is this more true than with regard to the nation's armed forces. For the first time in the history of the United States, full unity of purpose and action exists between its great armed forces and its powerful labor movement, and exists under circumstances where such unity is a decisive factor in securing victory.

This unity is in the fullest sense both a product of, and a condition for, the larger national unity which exists behind the war effort and present policies of our government. The labor movement could not, independently, have brought into being its present favorable relations with the men in our armed forces, and it cannot maintain and strengthen those relations independent of other class forces. The fight for labor-servicemen unity is first and foremost a fight to defend, extend, and consolidate enduring national unity around present government policy. Only those who fight for national unity are capable of contributing to labor-servicemen unity; and only those who support labor-servicemen unity are capable of contributing to national unity. An enemy of one is an enemy of both.

If the problem of maintaining and strengthening unity between organized labor, servicemen, and veterans is an integral part of the question of preserving national unity in order that the war may be won, and the peace safeguarded, it follows that this problem is not a narrow concern of labor alone, but on the contrary is a problem which concerns all forces having a stake in continued national unity. Labor cannot afford to adopt any policies or attitudes which do not contribute to keeping the problem on this plane.

Further, if the maintenance of national unity is the primary condition for a favorable relationship between labor and servicemen, it follows that the key issues around which national unity hinges must always be kept to the forefront in the struggle to consolidate labor-servicemen unity, and that all secondary considerations must be subordinated to these key issues.

Lastly, if the enormous contribution which organized labor is making to the winning of the war, both in the sphere of production and in politics, is the foundation for the unity that exists between servicemen and workers, it follows that if labor's internal enemies succeed in disrupting this contribution the very basis of unity will be destroyed.

Main Issues

The conduct of the Republican election campaign by the Hoover-Taft-Dewey-Bricker gang, and the action of the forces which directly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or indirectly support this campaign, have determined the main issues around which the struggle for labor-servicemen-veteran unity must be waged.

These issues are:

1. The full mobilization of the resources of the country for the final stage of the war against Germany and for the undertaking of decisive operations against Japan.

2. The maintaining of the foundations and direction of present United States international policy.

3. The preserving and extending of national unity on the basis of the present policies of the Government, through the fight to secure a realignment of forces within the country based on real issues.

4. The fight for reconversion policies, social security measures, wage levels, and foreign trade policies which will make possible the avoidance of a reconversion crisis and ensure a high level of post-war production.

5. The securing of all necessary measures, whether on the part of government, business, or organized labor, which are required to meet the *special problems* which confront servicemen as they re-enter civilian life.

Trends in Labor-Veteran Relations

The characteristic feature of relations between unions and veterans' organizations so far during the war has been the absence of active collaboration. This is true despite the fact that on many key issues, notably support of government war policy, they have followed parallel policies. A number of developments during the past several months have begun to make a change in this situation and afford a basis for the conclusion that the period of active collaboration between labor and veterans' organizations has begun.

Outstanding in this connection are the following developments:

1. In July of this year, the C.I.O., A. F. of L., and Veterans of Foreign Wars arrived at a national agreement covering many of the toughest problems in the field of labor-veteran relations. On the key question of seniority, this agreement goes much further than Selective Service Administration rulings in recommending measures which provide job security for veterans. For the serviceman who has a job with seniority status to go back to, it provides for accumulated seniority based on his length of service. For the serviceman without such a job to go back to, it provides that on getting a job he should immediately have credited to his seniority status his length of service in the armed forces. The U.A.W. at its convention endorsed the basic provisions of this agreement.

This agreement is a most important beginning in the field of labor-veteran collaboration and opens up the path which must be followed by the entire labor movement and all veterans' organizations both on a national and local level.

2. The wholehearted labor support given the Legion-sponsored "G.I. Rights Bill" has greatly improved labor-veteran relations. The unity behind this Bill is much more than agreement on a specific legis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lative measure. It is agreement on the basic principle that social security for the returning veteran is a national problem and a government responsibility.

3. Attitudes of hostility and distrust toward the established veterans' organizations which have carried over from the pre-war are beginning to break down. Outstanding in this connection is the action of the United Electrical and Radio Workers Union convention this year which called for "close cooperation with established veterans' organizations including the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Disabled American Veterans."

4. The policies adopted on the key issues confronting the country by the Legion convention in September of this year, despite certain important inconsistencies, mark a turning point in the history of labor-veteran relations. In the atmosphere created by the Dewey-Bricker campaign, and in face of concerted Republican pressure both from within and without its ranks, this convention endorsed the present foreign policy of our Government and called for national unity behind it. More forcefully than any other event to date, this convention of the Legion dramatized the wide and basic area of agreement which exists between organized labor and veterans. As these two great democratic forces in American life become more conscious of this area of agreement, and as active collaboration develops between them both on specific issues in the field of servicemen's affairs and on all matters vital to the nation, the policies of each will increasingly respond to and be influenced by the policies of the other. Few things hold more promise for the future than this.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FUEHRER LEWIS RUNS A CONVENTION

BY LOUIS F. BUDENZ

WITHIN the green-daubed walls of Cincinnati's ancient Music Hall, one of the most autocratically run labor assemblages in recent American history was staged in mid-September. The 38th constitutional convention of the United Mine Workers of America will long be remembered as an astounding exhibition of gag rule, expulsion threats and general denial of union democracy. The character of the decisions made by the platform and rammed down the throats of the delegates was in keeping with the autocratic methods employed to have them adopted.

The atmosphere of the platform was reminiscent of the storm trooper meetings staged by Hitler prior to the war, which came to us over the radio. The "Sieg Heil" or its equivalent alone was lacking, although there were efforts aplenty to drum up demonstrations of that kind. The delegates did not respond to the artificial enthusiasm which the Lewis machine men sought to create, and this caused that part of the Hitlerite repertoire to be absent.

Within the United Mine Workers and before the nation, Lewis was very much in the position of Hitler in maintaining his dictatorship. Like Hitler, Lewis needed the show of the rank and file, to make it appear that the mass of the miners upheld his views, and at the same time he crushed ruthlessly the desires of the rank and file. Even with his display of ruthlessness, he was obliged to carry through his reactionary policies with respect to the main matters before the convention through flank attacks, such as took place specifically in regard to the national Presidential contest. The objectives which he forwarded are of grave danger to the nation and the labor movement, but like Hitler he has aroused groups and tendencies which can curb him and his fascist-minded headlong assault on things democratic.

Even several of the anti-Roosevelt newspapers, which had sent their ace reporters out to Cincinnati to give Lewis a big play, felt it necessary to wash their hands of his all-too-raw despotic conduct before the convention was over. The *New York Herald Tribune* called Lewis "a little Hitler" in its editorial of Sept. 20, and added: "The resemblance to *Der Fuehrer* in word and deed strikes us as remarkable." The *Cincinnati Enquirer* summed up its views with this succinct sentence:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers apparently have hit upon the technique in democratic procedure —disqualify whatever opposes you."

The rank and file of the labor movement will put down indelibly in their memories the acts of autocracy which distinguished this latest exhibition of Lewis rule. They will make some mental notes of their own, one of which will be that such a flagrant defiance of union democracy and democratic procedure as Lewis followed at Cincinnati took place at the same moment that he was whooping it up for Thomas E. Dewey for the presidency. The two occurrences go hand in hand; Dewey-backing and union dictatorship are twin political events.

The prelude to the convention, the breaking up of the autonomy caucus at the Hotel Gibson by Lewis thugs led by known Lewis officials, was in keeping with his political aims. The postscript, under which the international executive board declared the "autonomy movement" dual in character and thereby suspended the Damocles' sword of expulsion over every man who would say anything for union democracy, was likewise in character. Even with all this artillery of terror at his disposal—with Ray Edmundson of District 12 unseated as a delegates because he led the autonomy movement and with Edmundson again declared ineligible to run for president—Lewis could only bring forward a left-handed approval of Dewey before the convention.

The Lewis-concocted report on political action, which a terrified and browbeaten convention adopted, resorts to hypocrisy in not endorsing any candidate for the presidency. The reasoning hit upon for that procedure is belabored and false. It refers to the "traditions" of the United Mine Workers in not directly endorsing candidates, although these "traditions" are blown to pieces by the admission that the union did endorse Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936.

It takes no skilled eye to detect that the real reasons for this hypocritical device are something else again, namely, that it was the sole means by which Lewis could try to get over an assault on the President. The arguments of the document are as hollow as is this device.

Never in the history of the trade union movement have those organizations enjoyed such strength or such legal rights under the law as during the administration of President Roosevelt. And yet, in the Lewis document the destruction of the unions is forecast if Roosevelt is re-elected. The irony of this bearing of false witness against the President is disclosed in the reports of the United Mine Workers submitted to this convention. They showed the U.M.W. to be in the best financial condition in its history (with $10,355,801.20 on hand, July 1, 1944) and with the largest membership in its 54 years' existence.

Strutting before the delegates in his opening and closing addresses, Lewis claimed that these successes were due to his sole, superman efforts. In making such bombastic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

statements, he carefully avoided the self-evident truth that every other union worth its salt is in exactly the same position as the U.M.W. They are all at the high tide of their career in finances and membership, and the policies put forward by the Roosevelt Administration have done much to make such reports realities.

The Roosevelt record is such as to cause President Philip Murray of the C.I.O. and President William Green of the A. F. of L. to commend it. That record is so deeply written in American life, in the enlarged unions of every community, in the strengthened security enjoyed by the working people, that it seems incredible that it could be contradicted. And yet, flowing from his America First principles and from that fatal document he signed with Herbert Hoover and Alfred Landon on August 5, 1941, aiding Hitler by assailing the Soviet Union and lend-lease, Lewis had the gall to condemn the President bitterly. Going further, he referred favorably to Dewey's labor record, with full knowledge on his part that the chief labor baiters of the country are rallying around Dewey. In the general acclaim which greets Mr. Roosevelt throughout the labor movement, it is the voice of Lewis alone which joins that of Bruiser Bill Hutcheson in huzzahing for the young man from Pawling.

The Bankruptcy of the Lewis Program

From that starting point, his defeatist views and his acclaim for Dewey, Lewis proceeded to force upon the convention one of the most bankrupt programs ever to be adopted by a labor union. In the name of pursuing economic gains alone, he gets the convention to evade all those matters which are vital to the working people and specifically to the miners. How does he propose to work out the matter of peacetime jobs? In these, the coal-digger is as much concerned as any other member of any other union. How is the exclusive preoccupation with economic demands going to meet that difficulty—by no means a small one? The verdict of history says it can't be done that way. If there is anything the labor movement can store up from its experience it is the uncontestable truth that such matters have to be dealt with politically. Just as faint heart never won fair lady, so "pure-and-simple" trade unionism never succeeded in hammering out such colossal undertakings as reconversion and demobilization.

It is a travesty which Lewis presents as the program on peace and reconversion. Eight resolutions had been placed before the delegates on these matters, in which the Kilgore Bill and similar proposals loomed large. In lieu of them all, the Lewis-amen Resolutions Committee brought in a substitute which contains eight meager lines. Reconversion consists merely in the stand for unemployment insurance and unemployment compensation, and on peace this proposal for Superman is made: "We further declare for labor representation at the Peace Conference and believe that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor's interests would best be protected by having as our representative, John L. Lewis, President of the United Mine Workers of America, whom we declare to be the greatest labor leader in America."

This declaration was not amusing or amazing any longer to delegates who had heard John Owens, Lewis henchman from Ohio, at the convention's opening, compare him to Christ, Joan of Arc and Abraham Lincoln and to hail him as "one of those rare and lofty souls whose penchant for humility makes them worthy to be entrusted with the cause of human liberty." Owens had continued by hailing Lewis as "the greatest industrial emancipator there is in America, the greatest labor leader the Mine Workers ever had."

This utter bankruptcy ran through the entire convention proceedings. Nowhere was it more crassly illustrated than in the substitute resolution on fascism, anti-Semitism and the poll tax, which were all lumped together. Cynically, this resolution merely reiterated the Red-baiting portion of the union's constitution which lumps Communists with Bundsmen and Klansmen, as people barred from membership. This was in reality a belittlement of the crying need for bold struggle against anti-Semitism and in keeping with the anti-Semitic innuendos apearing with such regularity in the pages of the *United Mine Workers Journal,* organ of the union.

To the dead silence on unity of the United Nations, on the huge urgency for adequate reconversion which exists and on a real fight for Negro rights—matters which stand out as imperative for labor to speak of today—there were added a number of crude misrepresentations. This was particularly illustrated by the declaration in the officers' report that President Roosevelt had vetoed the Smith-Connally-Harness Bill because it was not strict enough —an utterly false and fraudulent statement. It was witnessed again in its comment on the soldiers' vote bill, when these astounding words appeared: "The President created additional hostility to the Green-Lucas Bill by charging the Congress with perpetrating a fraud on the servicemen by their amendments to the bill. His sweeping indictment of all those who voted for these amendments was resented as unjust and demagogic." From this cowardly attack on the President for his splendid show of courage on the soldiers' vote measure, it is not difficult for the report to resort to this misrepresentation as an alibi for the Taft-Spangler opposition to the ballot bill: "The most of the Republican members of Congress and a large number of the members of the President's own party, feared that as the Commander-in-Chief is far better known to the troops than any opponent could possibly be; with control over the propaganda and news sent overseas through the Office of War Information, with a Federal ballot with the name of the candidate written in, the President would have an unfair advantage over any opponent." While pretending to stand for the soldiers' vote, the officers' report by these

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words gives every argument for the opponents of the proposal. It lines Lewis up logically with those who sought to rob the fighting men of their vote, the Deweys and the Tafts, just as Lewis sought to rob the fighting men of their strength in his production-harming stoppages.

Such bankruptcy, coupled with measures detested by the membership, such as the stand on the President, could only be sanctioned by the delegates through the exercise of the utmost autocracy by the Lewis machine. Within the convention this was accomplished through the revival of that old thuggery and intimidation which characterized the Lewis of pre-C.I.O. days. With the goon squad's breaking up of the autonomy caucus fresh in the delegates' minds, Lewis opened the convention with notification that rough stuff of that sort would continue if necessary. "What the hell am I supposed to be doing?" was the way he phrased it, accompanying that strong-arm language with expressions of wonder at the "patience" with which the opposition had been handled.

The lifting of Edmundson's credentials on the paltry plea that his dues were unpaid and the announcement by Lewis to the convention that the international executive board would undoubtedly declare the autonomy movement a dual one, added to the atmosphere of job fear. The voice of the delegates was effectually silenced, so far as any large-scale expression was concerned, and Lewis ruthlessly hurried through resolutions and discussions, with the gag being generously applied. This was particularly marked in the discussion of the political action report, on which Lewis announced that debate would be closed quickly right in the beginning. Shortly thereafter, with a number of delegates waiting at the microphones to be heard, he took it on himself—with no "question" being called for—to put the motion to snuff out the discussion.

It is an astounding fact to report that, as a consequence, five of the convention days were adjourned in less than an hour of actual convention business. The Saturday of the first week was passed by entirely, and the dispatch of real business could have been got over in two days at the most. It constituted no small waste of coal production for those who were coal-diggers and not office-holders, though of course the latter were out in force and are the backbone of the machine.

Right in his initial address, swaggering to conceal his defensive position, Lewis said: "Why gentlemen, there isn't any mincing, lackadaisical, lace-pantied gigolo going to dethrone John L. in his own organization and in his own convention." Then he proceeded to make good this threat, to the point of making it impossible for anyone to run against him for President. In the meager debate allowed on the autonomy issue, Lewis had said that the miners could get rid of him whenever they wanted to do so by voting him out of office and thereby getting rid of his appointive officers if they so choose. But he disproved this false argument when

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he debarred Edmundson from candidacy for office, through his own ruling, on the ground that he had not worked in or around the mines since July and that he had not paid his dues. It was well understood that if any one else had presented himself as a candidate for the presidency, he would be treated in a similar manner. Practically the last remnants of democracy were crushed out of the convention and out of the union, the whole process being capped by the extension of the officers' terms to four years and by the establishment of what is virtually a four-year period between conventions. Of course, this latter move was also accomplished by the aid of trickery. The scale convention is to meet every two years, but the constitutional convention every four years, according to the amendment crammed through. Since only two hours was permitted for discussion of the scale committee's report, it is pretty plain that the scale "convention" wil be an anemic affair.

Miners Chafe Under Lewis Rule

Of the more than 2,000 delegates always sitting in the convention—there were 3,000 in all but there was much coming and going in this gathering — only from 200 to 300 at the most ever rose against any measure. Does this mean that the Lewis viewpoint is agreed to by the miners out in the coal fields? We can state, without any wishful thinking, that it does not. Even the rabidly Republican correspondent George van Slyke, writing from Charleston, W. Va., for the rabidly Republican newspaper, the *New York Sun*, says on Oct. 11: "John L. Lewis is having trouble with his mine workers. He is against President Roosevelt, but the coal miners are asserting decided independence. Leaders of the unions are authority for the statement that a considerable proportion, probably a majority of the United Mine Workers, are disposed to favor Mr. Roosevelt."

All the reports available from the mining fields are to the same intent and purpose. We can definitely agree that the coal diggers are totally at variance with Lewis in his stand on the Presidency. The chief evil that the czar of the U.M.W. could accomplish is indicated by this correspondent Van Slyke when he hints that some of the miners may not vote at all. Fear of the Lewis machine could induce such an outcome in some areas. That is one aim which Lewis has, to prevent a large turn-out for F.D.R., and such a scheme fits in with the entire "low-voting" objective of the Republican high command.

Even though this be the case, does the near-unanimity of most of the convention decisions indicate that the Lewis stranglehold on the U.M.W. has been strengthened? Not necessarily. The very ruthlessness to which Lewis thought it essential to turn is a sign that the crown which it has set on his head sits uneasily. Technically Lewis has fastened his rule over the miners more drastically than ever before; but those people who view this convention as the culmination of a march upward for the U.M.W. presi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dent are looking at things superficially.

Lewis has not been riding a wave of victories. In the Congress of Industrial Organizations his main aims have been defeated. Even though the reverberations from his defeatists plots have led to some difficulties on the no-strike pledge in such unions as the United Auto Workers, they have not succeeded. The C.I.O., moreover, stands out strong against the Lewis divisive connivings. His plot to enter the American Federation of Labor has been pretty well rebuffed and set back for a considerable time. Labor on the whole has turned its back on his unpatriotic schemes and strategems.

Among the miners he still is able to manipulate the direction of events to the extent that he has created stoppages harmful to the war effort and has been able to have the mantle of this convention thrown over his Hitler-helping activities. That took the effort we have seen, nevertheless, an effort which diminished much of the success of his ruthless operations. In his big aim, to create a strong pro-Dewey bloc in the labor movement, he has dismally failed.

Lewis has been experiencing defeats in the national labor movement rather than chalking up victories. These defeats, unfortunately, have not been decisive, because the miners still record themselves officially for Lewis under the lack of autonomy, the whiplash of his expulsion threats, and the influence of the Lewis propaganda that he is the "indispensable man" for U.M.W. of A. leadership.

But Lewis' room for maneuvering has narrowed down considerably. Out of that arose the fact that at Cincinnati, because of his anti-victory position, he was compelled to come out more fully against the President than he might have considered it expedient to do. Even then, he had to evade a square facing of the F.D.R. versus Dewey test because regarding this question there is less confusion among the miners than regarding relations to the C.I.O. and A. F. of L. and other like questions. Moreover, the attitude toward the President (being also the attitude toward complete anti-Hitler victory and the peace) is the fundamental issue at the present moment. The convention, as we have noted, did not settle this matter, and the pro-Dewey position of Lewis is bound to bring him into more direct conflict with that of the miners than has been the case on other issues in previous years.

Furthermore, for the first time since 1926, Lewis found himself with the beginnings of an organized opposition in his own ranks. This was expressed in the autonomy movement, in which Ray Edmundson and others played a prominent part. This movement attracted such serious support that Lewis abandoned his pretense of ignoring it and resorted to open gangster attacks. By these methods, he was able to disorganize the autonomy and pro-Roosevelt forces at the Convention and prevent them from conducting an effective fight. But Lewis did not crush the discontent with the lack of democracy and the de-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

featist policies he has been imposing on the miners. This first effort to fight for a program that is in the miners' interests is bound to continue and gain strength, notwithstanding the "victories" of Lewis at the Convention.

Weaknesses of the Progressives

Among those who stood out against the Lewis viewpoint at the convention there were shortcomings which cannot be overlooked. Undemocratic procedure, of course, was the main cause for Lewis' coming out of the convention as he did. That was not all. Those who took the initiative in raising the vital issue of autonomy—which will have to be settled right if union democracy is ever to exist in the U.M.W.—did not quickly enough understand that Mr. Roosevelt's re-election was the biggest and broadest concern of the miners. The autonomy champions narrowed down their battle to that subject alone, and only one speaker even referred to the connection of this fight for union democracy with the forwarding of the election and the policies of the President.

This narrowness of the autonomy movement was exhibited again dramatically in the case of Negro rights. The failure of the autonomy leaders to show the connection between union democracy and the rights of the Negro people allowed Lewis to exploit the progressive sentiments of the Negroes in his own behalf. The Negro delegates are not fully aware that the measure of no discrimination found in the U.M.W.A. arises from the very tradition and history of the union miners. They, therefore, often attribute the progressive trend to Lewis personally. In regard to the autonomy debate, the only Negro speakers who took the floor spoke for the Lewis attitude on that matter. That this did not represent complete agreement with the Lewis policies on their part was seen by the voices raised later for Roosevelt's re-election, in one instance at least by the very delegate who had previously spoken for the continued denial of autonomy. It is incontestable that in the future, the autonomy issue, however raised, will have to be broader in its appeal and particularly emphasize how it is interwoven definitely with the Teheran policies in their domestic and international aspects.

There is much to be done now, in the period following the convention. There is the urgency for getting out the vote for the President in the mining fields. The strong sentiment for the President is there; it is now vital that it be so stimulated, as to go to the polls and express itself. Those who stand for Mr. Roosevelt can work actively together to see that there are no losses in the coal regions because of the Lewis stand.

There can be no let-up in the fight for union democracy. Lewis' high-handed denial of democratic rights to the miners will not silence them. It should make the miners fight.

The membership, by those methods they will find effective, will have to oppose the four-year-term for international officers, denounce

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the unseating of Edmundson and act all along the line for democratic procedure.

In regard to the wages and hours question, which Lewis hypocritically holds up as the only thing the miners should pay any attention to, the coal diggers will not be helped by such an attitude. Legislation on reconversion and other acts of the governmental bodies will have to come into play in order to assure the economic background against which demands can be successfully put forward. That requires deep interest and activity in the present national election, and after the election in the legislative bodies of the country.

The miners have a huge stake in a full victory over Hitlerism, in a durable peace and in an adequate reconversion program. Their jobs and their wages are tied up with these events. They cannot protect themselves in these respects by following Lewis in evasion, which in reality is serving Hooverism; they can do this only by committing their union to vigorous political activity in common with the broad trade union movement for the policies grouped under the banner of President Roosevelt.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARMISTICE AGREEMENT WITH FINLAND*

ON SEPTEMBER 19 an agreement was signed in Moscow between the Soviet Union and Great Britain, on the one hand, and Finland on the other. Representatives of the Soviet Union and Great Britain conducted the negotiations with representatives of Finland on behalf of all the United Nations at war with Finland.

The Agreement was signed, by authorization of the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and Great Britain, by Colonel General Zhdanov, and by representatives of the Government of Finland. Finland's withdrawal from the war and the conclusion of an armistic agreement with her is a new big military and political defeat for Hitlerite Germany and an important success for the policy of the Soviet Union and all the United Nations.

One after another Hitlerite Germany's allies of yesterday are breaking with her. Following Rumania, which served as the southern flank of the German front against the U.S.S.R. and a *place d'armes* of the German offensive on the Balkans and the Middle East, Finland—which played the part of the other flank of the German offensive on the Soviet Union and the most important strategic *place d'armes* in the entire north and in the Baltic area—has broken with Germany.

In the person of her ruling circles, Finland was one of the most malicious and obstinate allies of Hitlerite Germany. Despite the fact that the alliance with the latter brought Finland to the verge of disaster, Finnish ruling circles did not wish to break relations with fascist Germany, and tried in every way to drag out the war, in the hope that the war situation would change in Germany's favor.

Finland thwarted the negotiations for an armistice which were begun upon the request of the Finnish government itself in February, 1944. Moreover, in June, 1944, the Finnish rulers, with President Ryti at their head, concluded a new military agreement with Hitlerite Germany aimed at increasing Finland's activity in the war against the United Nations.

The so-called Ryti - Ribbentrop agreement, however, proved to be stillborn, and as is well known existed for only one month. Events which developed on the Soviet-German front, including its Finnish sector, and also on the Western Front, have demonstrated with the utmost clarity that Hitlerite Germany is on the eve of utter defeat and that consequently all calculations and hopes which the Finnish and other

* From an editorial in *Pravda* on September 21, 1944.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

politicians placed upon Germany have finally fallen through.

In his broadcast speech of September 3, Prime Minister Hackzell admitted that the "military and political situation in Finland has sharply changed for the worse."

After long procrastinations, the Government of Finland again posed the question concerning an armistice and accepted the preliminary condition of the Soviet Government to break with Germany, and that not a single German should remain on the territory of Finland who would not be disarmed and turned over to the Allies. On this basis, the possibility was opened to conclude an armistice agreement.

This Agreement meets the interests of all the United Nations and constitutes another proof of their growing cooperation and fighting unity. It goes without saying that when concluding the Armistice Agreement with Finland, the Governments of the Soviet Union and Great Britain paid great attention to insuring the necessary conditions for dealing further blows to Hitlerite Germany, so as to hasten her defeat.

The Agreement binds Finland to make available at the request of the Allied (Soviet) High Command, airdromes on the southern and southwestern coast of Finland during the period necessary for air operations against the German forces in Estonia and against the German navy in the northern part of the Baltic Sea. Until the end of the war, Allied naval vessels and merchant ships shall have the right to make use of the territorial waters of the ports of Finland.

Under the Agreement, German land, naval and air forces which have remained in Finland after September 15, 1944, must be disarmed and their personnel handed over to the Allied (Soviet) High Command as war prisoners. The Government of the Soviet Union undertook to render the necessary assistance in disarming the German forces in Finland.

The basic interests of the war of the United Nations against Hitlerite Germany require that Finland actually cease to serve as Germany's base, and that the Hitlerite influence in Finland be entirely eliminated.

Of essential importance are those terms of the Armistice Agreement which bind Finland to break all relations with Germany's satellites; to dissolve immediately pro-Hitler organizations (or of a fascist type) as well as other organizations conducting propaganda hostile to the United Nations, in particular to the Soviet Union, and not to permit in the future the existence of organizations of that nature; to collaborate with the Allied powers in the apprehension of persons accused of war crimes and in their trial.

Finland undertakes immediately to release all persons, irrespective of citizenship or nationality, held in prison on account of their activities in favor of the United Nations or because of their sympathies with the cause of the United Nations.

The Armistice Agreement solves a number of problems which directly concern the Soviet Union and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finland. In the course of 25 years, the ruling circles of the Finnish bourgeoisie were steadfastly and consistently pursuing an anti-Soviet policy. Instead of insuring truly good neighborly relations with the great Soviet Union, which granted a state of independence to Finland in 1917, the Finnish rulers converted Finland into a hotbed of constant anti-Soviet provocations and military adventures.

Within a quarter of a century, Finland has three times conducted hostilities against the peoples of the Soviet Union. The whole world is well aware of the part played by Finland in the present war. She not only placed the most important strategical bases at Germany's disposal, which the Germans used both against the U.S.S.R. and other United Nations, but the Finns took an active part in military operations against the Soviet Union, established a brutal occupation regime on temporarily occupied Soviet territory, and participated in the criminal blockade of Leningrad.

From the experience of the policy pursued by Finland's ruling circles for more than 25 years, from the experience of the war of 1939-1940 and especially the war of 1941-1944, the Soviet people draws the decisive conclusion that the firm, stable security of the northwestern frontiers of the U.S.S.R., and that of Leningrad in the first place, must be insured forever as a result of the present war.

The effect of the peace treaty between the Soviet Union and Finland concluded in Moscow on March 12, 1940, is restored under the Armistice Agreement, with certain changes. Finland undertakes immediately to withdraw her troops behind the line of the Soviet-Finnish frontier of 1940 and to place her army on a peace footing within two and one-half months. The Petsamo Region, which was twice (in 1920 and in 1940) voluntarily and generously ceded to Finland by the Soviet Union, and which was used by the Finns in the war against the U.S.S.R., will be returned to the Soviet Union. In the area of Porkkala-Udd, that is, the narrowest part of the Gulf of Finland, the Soviet Union will establish its own naval base. On its part, the Soviet Union renounces its rights to the lease of the Peninsula of Hango. The effect of the Agreement concerning the Aaland Islands, concluded on October 11, 1940, is completely restored.

Finland has caused tremendous damage to the Soviet Union. The Armistice Agreement provides for indemnification of part of the losses caused the U.S.S.R., and that indemnification is restricted to $300,000,000, which goes to prove once again exceptional generosity on the part of the Soviet Union.

At the same time, Finland is bound to return to the Soviet Union within a fixed period, in completely good condition, all valuables and materials removed from Soviet territory to Finland, belonging to state, public and cooperative organizations or individual citizens.

The conditions of the Armistice Agreement emphasize once again the fact that the Soviet Union, true

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to its international policy, has never threatened and does not intend to threaten Finland's state sovereignty and independence. It is natural that, in the interests of the further prosecution of the war against Hitlerite Germany, the Allied powers must pay special attention to complete and strict observance by Finland of all the conditions of the Armistice Agreement. With this purpose, an Allied Control Commission will be established which will carry out its responsible and great tasks under the general direction and instructions of the Allied (Soviet) High Command.

However, the imperative question in this is the immediate execution by Finland of the Allies' preliminary condition. Indeed, nearly one week has passed since Finland was to start disarming German troops on Finnish territory and handing them over to the Allies as war prisoners. So far, not a single German soldier in Finland has been disarmed or handed over to the Allies. Meanwhile, the Hitlerite radio in Germany keeps broadcasting for all the world to hear that German troops are retreating over Finnish territory with the obliging assistance of the Finnish authorities.

Thus, it is necessary as yet to insure the execution of the above-said preliminary condition without permitting any further delay in this matter.

The freedom-loving peoples will be satisfied with the conclusion of the armistice with Finland, which signifies an actual reduction of the sphere of war. The Agreement helps the Soviet Union in the achievement of its aims in this war of liberation against German fascism. The freedom-loving peoples will see in this act of the Soviet Union and the United Nations a new step toward the final and early defeat of the hateful enemy of all freedom-loving peoples — Hitlerite Germany.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books on American History

THE STRUGGLE FOR AMERICAN FREEDOM:

THE FIRST TWO HUNDRED YEARS

By Herbert M. Morais

Beginning with the English background of American history, this new study traces the settlement and development of the thirteen colonies, the growth of agriculture, commerce and industry, the rise of democratic institutions, the impact of mercantilism, the organization of colonial resistance and the successful fight for independence, ending with the triumph of the democratic forces under Jefferson.

Price $2.25

THE RISE OF THE AMERICAN NATION 1793-1824

By Francis Franklin

Interpreting the main events in the national development of the United States during its early history, this book covers the period from the establishment of the Federal Government in 1789 to the end of Monroe's second administration in 1825. It describes the democratic victory over Federalist reaction led by Jefferson and the national victory over foreign aggression in the War of 1812, concluding with an evaluation of the emergence in 1824 of new party formations reflecting the new economic groupings.

Price $2.00

"BUILDERS OF THE NATION" LIBRARY

Edited by Dr. Philip Foner

Abraham Lincoln: Selections From His Writings
Thomas Jefferson: Selections From His Writings
George Washington: Selections From His Writings

Cloth $.85, Paper $.25

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Book That Will Be Read 100 Years From Now—

THE PATH TO PEACE, PROGRESS AND PROSPERITY

Proceedings of the Founding Convention of the Communist Political Association

"A hundred years from now, men and women and boys and girls will still read it in libraries in every city of the world, because it gives an essential part of the history of our time. But it is not published for future historians. It is put into your hands as an instrument of war. . . .

"In this book you have the most advanced thought of the world-wide labor movement—the supposedly "mysterious" Marxist science —in the form of clear, simple political and economic sense expounded in plain American language from which the trace of Browder's native Kansas prairie is never missing."

ROBERT MINOR, from Introduction to
The Path to Peace, Progress and Prosperity

144 pages, Price $1.00

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P.O. Box 148, Station D (832 Broadway), New York 3, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED